University of London

607999

REPORTS

FROM

COMMISSIONERS, INSPECTORS,

AND OTHERS:

TWENTY-SEVEN VOLUMES.

—*(1.)*—

~~ARMY (EDUCATION OF OFFICERS);~~
ARMY (PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT);
ARMY (RECRUITING);
ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY (WOOLWICH);
PATRIOTIC FUND.

Session

8 *February*—— 15 *August* 1876.

VOL. XV. XVI.

Folio portions.

1876.

REPORTS

FROM

COMMISSIONERS, INSPECTORS,

AND OTHERS:

1876.

TWENTY-SEVEN VOLUMES:—CONTENTS OF THE

FIRST VOLUME.

N.B.—*THE* Figures *at the* beginning of the line, *correspond with the* N° *at* the *foot of each* Report; *and the* Figures *at the* end of the line, *refer to the* MS. Paging *of the Volumes arranged for The House of Commons.*

ARMY (EDUCATION OF OFFICERS): *

[c. 1491.] Second Report on the Education of Officers by the Director General of Military Education - - - - - p. 1

ARMY (PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT):

[c. 1569.] Report of the Royal Commission on Army Promotion and Retirement, together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index - - - - - - - - - - 77

ARMY (RECRUITING):

[c. 1435.] Report by the Inspector General of Recruiting upon Recruiting for the Regular Army for the Year 1875 - - - 437

ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH:

[c. 1614.] Report of the Board of Visitors appointed for the Year 1876 to inspect the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich - - 445

PATRIOTIC FUND:

[c. 1378.] Fourteenth Report of the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund, 1875 - - - - - - - - 451

---

* For this 8vo paper see "Vol XV. XVI Octavo portions"

REPORTS

FROM

COMMISSIONERS, INSPECTORS,

AND OTHERS:

1870.

TWENTY-SEVEN VOLUMES—CONTENTS OF THE

FIRST VOLUME.

REPORT

OF THE

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

ARMY PROMOTION

AND

RETIREMENT;

TOGETHER WITH

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, APPENDIX, AND INDEX.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY GEORGE EDWARD EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1876.

[C.—1569.] *Price* 5*s.* 8*d.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
COMMISSION	iii
REPORT	vii
ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES	1
DIGEST OF EVIDENCE	3
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	21
APPENDIX	197
REPORT ON CERTAIN SPECIAL SUBJECTS REFERRED TO THE ROYAL COMMISSION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR	285
INDEX	297

COMMISSION.

VICTORIA R.

VICTORIA, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith,—

To Our Right Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor James Plaisted, Baron Penzance,—
Our Right Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor John Somerset, Baron Hampton, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath,—
Our Right Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Esquire,—
Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Edwin Beaumont Johnson, Esquire, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, and Major-General in Our Army,—
Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Arthur James Herbert, Esquire, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, and Major-General in Our Army,—
Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Reginald Earle Welby, Esquire, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath,—
Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Charles John Foster, Esquire, Major-General in Our Army,—
Greeting:

Whereas by Our Royal Warrant, dated the 20th day of July, in the Thirty-fifth year of Our Reign, We did cancel and determine all regulations made by Us or any of Our Royal predecessors, or by any Officers acting under Our authority, regulating or fixing the prices at which any Commissions in Our Forces might be purchased, sold, or exchanged, or in any way authorising the purchase or sale or exchange for money of any such Commissions.

And whereas such regulations being cancelled, all traffic in Commissions became illegal, and any Officer or person buying or selling a Commission became liable to penalty under the Act passed in the session holden in the fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, chapter 16, intituled "Against buying and selling of Offices," and the Act passed in the forty-ninth year of the reign of King George the Third, chapter 126, intituled "An Act for the prevention of the Sale and Brokerage of Offices."

And whereas by the Act passed in the session holden in the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth years of Our reign, chapter 86, intituled "An Act for the better regulation of the Regular and Auxiliary Land Forces of the Crown," rules were enacted for compensating Officers in certain circumstances, by the payment to them of the value of the Commissions they might severally hold at the time of the cessation of Purchase in the Army.

And whereas in Our Royal Warrant, dated the 30th day of October 1871, in providing for certain changes then necssary in respect of First Appointments, Regimental Promotion, and Exchanges, We did premise that such provision was pending a more complete revision of that section of Our Warrant of the 27th December 1870, which governed the promotion of combatant Officers.

And whereas certain Officers of Our Army did memorialise Us, alleging certain grievances which they stated that they suffered in consequence of the Abolition of Purchase.

And whereas an humble address was presented to Us by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, praying Us to issue Our Royal Commission for Inquiry into the allegation of the said Officers.

And whereas, by Our Royal Commission, dated the 11th day of October 1873, We did appoint Sir William Milbourne James, James Plaisted Baron Penzance, and George Ward Hunt, to be Our Commissioners for the purpose of examining the allegations contained in the memorials of the Officers aforesaid.

And whereas the said Commissioners, in their Report to Us, dated the 1st day of June 1874, did represent that the question of compensation to Officers ought not to be dissociated from that of promotion; but that the general question of the means proper to maintain the flow of promotion in the Army for the future was not before them.

And whereas an assurance was given by Our responsible Minister, that notwithstanding the Abolition of Purchase, a reasonable rapidity of promotion not differing essentially from that which obtained before such abolition, should be maintained for the future.

And whereas it is desirable to make a full inquiry with a view to ascertain the best means of ensuring such rapidity of promotion, and making adequate provision for promotion throughout the Army.

Now Know Ye, that We, reposing great Trust and Confidence in your Zeal, Ability and Discretion, have authorised and appointed, and by these Presents do authorise and appoint you, the said James Plaisted Baron Penzance, John Somerset Baron Hampton, Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Edwin Beaumont Johnson, Arthur James Herbert, Reginald Earle Welby, and Charles John Foster, or any three or more of you, to be Our Commissioners for the purpose of inquiring into the said matter.

And We do give and grant to you, or to any three or more of you, full power and authority to call before you such persons as you may deem necessary, and to obtain information from them upon the subject of your inquiry, and of every matter connected therewith, and also to call for, have access to, and examine all such official books, documents, papers, and records, as may appear to you, or to any three or more of you, likely to be of use in affording you the fullest information.

And We do hereby require and command you, or any three or more of you, to report to Us under your hands and seals, with all convenient speed, upon the questions which by these Presents We do refer to you; namely—

What rapidity of promotion should be considered as having obtained, on the average, in the several arms under the Purchase System:

And by what means such rapidity may be best secured in the future with justice to the Officers of all ranks in those corps which were under the Purchase System:

And, further, in what manner adequate promotion of Officers to maintain the efficiency of the whole army in all its combatant branches may most effectively be obtained:

And in what way the relations of the Officers of Our British Forces to Officers of Our Indian Staff Corps may be so adjusted as to do justice to each.

And, We Will and Command, and by these Presents ordain, that this Our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you, Our said Commissioners, or any three or more of you, may from time to time proceed in the execution thereof, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

And for your assistance in the due execution of this our Commission, We have made choice of Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Digby Pigott, Esquire, to be Secretary to this Our Commission and to attend you, whose services and assistance, as well as the services and assistance of such clerks and other persons as may appear to you to be necessary, We require you to use from time to time as occasion shall require.

Given at Our Court at Balmoral, this Seventh day of November 1874, in the Thirty-eighth year of Our Reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,

GATHORNE HARDY.

REPORT.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

We, Your Majesty's Commissioners, having been appointed by Your Majesty to inquire into the best means of making adequate provision for maintaining a reasonable rapidity of promotion throughout the Army, have diligently inquired into the subjects to which our attention has been directed, and most humbly submit to Your Majesty the results of our inquiries.

Introductory remarks.

We have taken a considerable body of evidence which will be found in the Appendix, and we have availed ourselves of the best advice which the profession afforded us. We have also had laid before us the systems of organization and promotion now existing in the French and German Armies, but the military profession is followed in those countries under circumstances so widely different from those attending the British Army, that they have not afforded us material assistance.

See Appendix A. and the evidence of General Walker, Colonel Conolly, and Colonel Goodenough.

We find that on various former occasions the proper means for maintaining an adequate flow of promotion among the officers in the Army have been considered by Royal Commissions and Committees of the House of Commons, and their Reports have on many points been of great service to us.

See Appendix B.

But on the main question of which it devolves upon us to offer a solution, namely, how to devise a regular system under which an adequate flow of promotion shall be maintained after the late great changes these Reports have afforded us little aid.

And for this reason: As far as they dealt with the great body of officers—that is, the Infantry and Cavalry of the Line, together with the Guards and Household Cavalry,—they dealt with a body of men whose promotion depended upon, and for the most part was secured by, the system of Purchase, then in full operation. And as far as they dealt with the Ordnance Corps, in which the Purchase System did not exist, their recommendations, so far as carried into effect, were limited to temporary expedients and created no permanent system. We find nothing therefore that can be properly called a system in force for the Non-Purchase Corps; and the system that was in force for the Purchase Corps has been extinguished by the Warrant abolishing Purchase.

Rate of promotion under Purchase System.

The first question to which we are commanded to address our attention is "What rapidity of promotion should be considered on the average to have "obtained in the several arms under the Purchase System?"

The answer is given in the calculated averages which are to be found in the Appendix to our Report.

See Appendix C.

These averages extend over the 30 years immediately preceding the abolition of Purchase, and they show rates of promotion which differ for the different arms of the service, the Cavalry of the Line being the most rapid, the Household Cavalry the slowest, and the Infantry of the Line between the two.

We think on the whole that the rates shown for the Infantry of the Line by far the largest portion of the Army) should be considered for practical

purposes as the average rapidity of promotion which obtained in the Army under the Purchase System.

They are as follows :

	Years.	Months.
The rank of lieutenant was obtained after serving - -	2	8
That of captain after serving - - - - -	9	0
That of major after serving - - - - -	18	11
That of lieutenant-colonel after serving - - -	23	6

Rate of promotion since abolition of Purchase.

It is hardly necessary to observe that this rate of promotion has not been sustained in the great body of the Army since the Purchase System was abandoned.

See Appendix D.

At the time Purchase was abolished in the Infantry of the Line there were 96 majors who had served more than 23 years and 6 months; 134 captains who had served more than 18 years and 11 months; and 507 lieutenants who had served more than 9 years; in all 737 officers who had served beyond the average periods respectively.

There were on the 1st July 1875—

96 majors,
421 captains,
583 lieutenants and sub-lieutenants,

in all 1,100 officers in a similar position, that is, who had served more than the above periods respectively.

And this excess over the standard periods of service has since that date considerably increased, and is likely to increase still further in the future, because the number of those who desired to leave the Army after the changes of 1871, have already been brought into the account, and none but permanent causes of vacancy can be relied upon.

Among these permanent causes, and almost the only one except death, is that created by the Royal Warrant of 30th October 1871, under which every subsequent appointment to a lieutenant-colonelcy or to a majority is to be vacated every five years.

This Warrant will begin to take practical effect in producing promotion in the course of the current year, when the first officers appointed under it will have completed their five years' service.

But it is obvious that its effect cannot for many years be very considerable.

Probable future rate of promotion under existing rules.

In this state of things we have thought it right before entering upon the consideration of any new methods of achieving promotion, to endeavour to ascertain by calculation what rate of promotion would be ultimately brought about by the regulations at present in force if adhered to without alteration.

Appendix E.

The results will be found in the paper quoted in the margin; and taking the Infantry alone, it appears that under present regulations, the officer will be nearly seven years longer in the service before reaching the rank of captain than he was under Purchase, ten years longer before becoming a major, and ten years longer before reaching the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

This result would constitute a stagnation in promotion, of which the officers might justly complain.

But further, it would, we conceive, be destructive of the efficiency of the Army, for the average age of the officer on attaining the rank of captain would be upwards of 35 years, the field officer's rank would not be reached till upwards of 49 years, and the command of the regiment be only acquired on the average at the age of 53 years and six months.

Vacancies required annually to secure promotion at Purchase rates.

We have caused a calculation to be made of the number of vacancies in each rank which require to be by some means brought about annually, in order to maintain a flow of promotion equal to that which existed under Purchase.

Appendix G.

The result will be found in the Actuaries' Report, referred to in the margin.

It appears from this Report that after allowing for all vacancies which the present regulations and the average death-rate would produce, there will, in the Infantry of the Line alone, be 33 majors, 73 captains, and 29 subalterns annually for whom no promotion is available, and who must be by some means removed, if the requisite rate of promotion is to be maintained.

These calculations have been made, it must be borne in mind, for what may be called the Army of the future, and no allowance is therefore made for such of the existing Purchase officers as will from time to time retire to secure their Purchase money.

At present the Purchase officers form the great bulk of the officers in the Army, but, if a system is to be devised of a permanent nature, retirements due to the remaining influence of the Purchase System must for the moment be disregarded as temporary only.

We have therefore thought it best to deal with the general and permanent question of promotion first, and then to adapt our recommendations to the case of the existing Purchase officers, and it is in this sense that our subsequent observations must be understood.

Means of obtaining promotion in the future.

The insufficiency of the existing regulations as a permanent system is so plainly made manifest in the above Report, that we approach the second question which we are commanded to entertain, viz., "By what means the "rapidity of promotion which obtained under Purchase can be best secured" in the future, with the conviction that no mere patchwork or temporary expedients will be satisfactory, but that existing methods and rules demand an entire and careful review. Appendix E.

It is not, perhaps, surprising, that while the Purchase System existed by which promotion among the officers was secured at their own expense, no attempt should have been made to deal with the entire question of retirement and promotion in the Army as a whole on any broad and general basis, or to grapple with the inherent and inevitable difficulties of the subject.

But now that Purchase has been abolished, and that the Guards, the Household Troops, and the Line are dependent for their promotion like the Ordnance Corps on retirements to be provided by the State, it is, we think, reasonable to expect that the difficulties of the subject should be fairly met, and that the necessary expenditure, which must be considerable, should be applied upon some sound and permanent principle.

Difficulty of obtaining promotion increased by organisation of Regiments.

We find that the chief and ever-present difficulty of securing promotion in all corps lies in this single circumstance, *that the number of officers in each of the successive ranks is widely unequal;** those in the upper ranks being few and in the lower numerous.

For instance, a battalion of the Line may be stated generally to be thus constituted—

1 lieutenant-colonel,
2 majors,
11 captains,
18 subalterns.

There are, therefore, only 1 commission of lieutenant-colonel and 2 commissions of major to be successively filled (subject to deaths and voluntary retirements) by 29 officers below those ranks.

This organisation of Regimental Ranks makes it absolutely impossible in time of peace that continuous promotion to the head of his regiment should be given to each officer in succession, except upon one of two conditions, both equally absurd, viz., that the highest rank should only be reached in extreme old age, or that the command of the regiment should be compulsorily vacated after being held only for a few months. See Appendix H.

The late Royal Warrant to which we have already alluded has provided that the commissions of lieutenant-colonel and major respectively shall be held only for five years. This will give promotion to two officers in the rank of captain and two in the rank of subaltern every five years.

If the system were carried further, and the five years much shortened, the promotion would of course be greatly accelerated. But we believe that this would be utterly inconsistent with efficiency, and that the period of five years will not bear reduction.

We insist then at the outset upon this fact *of unequal ranks*, because we believe that many schemes of retirement in various branches of the public service have failed from a neglect to take this inequality into due account,

* The Diagrams in Appendix F., which are drawn to scale, the length of the spaces representing the numbers in each rank, exhibit this inequality very clearly.

and its existence is the justification of the scheme we shall propose for the future.

There is of course an alternative method by which the requisite promotion can be obtained, namely, by creating supernumeraries and keeping on full pay in the higher ranks more officers than are required for the needs of the service. This method of securing promotion is embodied in a complete form in the Indian Staff Corps, which is organised upon the principle of giving to each officer after a definite length of service a step in rank without reference to vacancies or the number of officers already filling that rank.

But this is practically increasing the numbers of the higher ranks, and thereby altering the existing organisation; whereas the question put to us we conceive to be subject to the condition of maintaining the existing organisation.

This will more fully appear hereafter. We mention the subject now that it may not be supposed to have escaped attention, and we proceed on the supposition that the numbers in the higher ranks are actually as well as nominally confined in the Infantry to one lieutenant-colonel and two majors in each battalion.

Retirements necessary in lower as well as upper ranks.

In this state of things it is evident to us that it would be hopeless to look for adequate promotion from any system of retirement *which is applied only to the upper ranks*, for the simple reason that they cannot without detriment to efficiency and at an excessive cost be vacated often enough to give the steps required.

It follows, then, that retirements will have to be brought about in the lower as well as the upper ranks, and this can only be done in the main by means of a pension or sum of money on retiring, whether by compulsion or choice.

It is so natural in every department to couple pension and retirement with length of service, specially meritorious exertion, or ill-health, that at first sight any proposal to give pensions upon any other principle or for any other objects does not recommend itself.

But, properly understood, we conceive that any money given to an officer to induce his retirement, if voluntary, or to accompany it if compulsory, is really nothing more than a species of deferred pay, and should be regarded in connexion with his actual pay as part of the advantages offered him in return for his services.

The State requires a certain limited number of officers to fill the higher ranks of the Army; it requires at the same time another and very much larger body of officers to fill the lower ranks; it is impossible to offer to each and all of the latter promotion to the higher ranks within any reasonable time, but it is practicable and reasonable to offer to those who cannot be promoted a pecuniary recompense when called upon to retire.

It would, of course, be possible to provide that the entire remuneration of officers should consist in an adequate rate of pay while serving, without any pension or sum of money on retirement, but the evil of such a system lies on the surface. Some officers must necessarily receive promotion, while some must necessarily retire. If the whole remuneration of the officers takes the form of pay while serving, the man who ultimately gets promotion is all along as well off as the man who is forced to retire without it, and gets promotion into the bargain. The system of pensions by way of deferred pay can alone equalise their positions.

The mode in which and the conditions under which we should propose that the requisite retirements should be effected will be presently detailed; what we desire to bring into prominent notice now is our conviction—

1. That promotion cannot in future be sustained without retirement being effected in the lower ranks.
2. That these retirements must in some form be brought about or accompanied by a pension or sum of money.

Necessity for retirements from lower ranks proved by experience under Purchase System.

These conclusions would have recommended themselves to us as a matter of reasoning, independent of experience. But we have done our best to ascertain the working of all those causes which have sustained or failed to sustain promotion in the past, and they confirm what we have just said in a remarkable manner.

To begin with the Purchase Infantry of the Line (excluding Colonial Corps)—practically the great body of the Army—if the statistics be consulted for 10 years before Purchase was abolished, it will be found that within that period the number of officers who sold out of the Army in the rank of lieutenant-colonel were 49, those in the rank of major 133, while those in the rank of captain were 1,051, and the lieutenants and ensigns who sold out numbered no less than 1,623.

See the Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on Officers Memorials, page 138.

These figures reveal a fact which cannot be overlooked in the preparation of any system which is to supply the place of Purchase.

They show that promotion was really brought about not so much by making constant vacancies in the higher commissions, as by continually withdrawing large numbers from the lower ranks, and thus leaving the way open for those that remained, when the vacancies in the higher ranks occurred.

And this produced a rate of promotion which was, even in time of peace, reasonably rapid, and gave on the whole satisfaction to the officers.

Proved also by experience of Ordnance Corps.

A more valuable lesson still is to be learnt by turning to the experience of the Non-Purchase (Ordnance) Corps.

These corps have been placed in the past in the same position as the whole Army will be placed in the future, that is to say, their officers had no inducements to retire except private convenience or State pensions.

It is obvious, then, that the experience of these corps must in any aspect be most valuable, and ought to act either as a beacon or a guide in finding a path for the future.

The first fact that meets us in that experience is that the number of those who retire from private motives *without any pension or sum of money* is so trifling as to be inappreciable. In the last 20 years, in the Regiment of Artillery, they have not on the average exceeded in number six of all ranks in a year, while in the Engineers the average is one and a half.

See Appendix I.

The next and most important fact is that the pensions which have from time to time been offered by the State have been almost uniformly offered only to those above the rank of captain; though comparatively liberal, they have not always been accepted, and have not sufficed to sustain promotion.

Promotion has in fact only been sustained from time to time by exceptional methods and contrivances.

First by great augmentations, then by additional pensions, then by creating supernumeraries, and by an attempt, on a small scale, and by a special and temporary vote, to create vacancies in the lower ranks, and, finally, by altering the regimental organisation. We shall revert more fully hereafter to this temporary vote for creating retirements in the lower ranks, which was taken under the authority of Lord Cardwell; it is enough to say here that it appears to have been successful as far as it went.

See Appendix J.

The detail of these methods will be found in Reports made to us by Colonel Radcliffe, the Deputy Adjutant-General of Royal Artillery, and Colonel Browne, the late Deputy Adjutant-General of Royal Engineers, respectively, referred to in the margin.

Appendix K. (Parts 1 and 2.)

With this history of the past 20 years before it, the Committee of the House of Commons, which sat under the presidency of Mr. Childers in 1867, reported that "the system or rather combination of contrivances under "which officers are retired from the Artillery and Engineers is complicated, "uncertain in its operation, based on no sure principle, and inadequate for "its purpose."

Report of Select Committee on Army (System of Retirement), 1867, s. 6.

We cannot but concur in that statement, and we are of opinion that these various expedients, being based upon no general principle, are incapable of being framed into a system on which any reliance can be placed for the future, and that, unless peace should be broken, or fresh augmentations should take place, there is little doubt that stagnation will be inevitable.

See Appendix L. (Part I.)

We are, therefore, satisfied by the experience of the past, as well as by abstract reasoning, that the method hitherto employed, vizt., that of creating vacancies in the upper ranks alone is incapable of creating and sustaining a regular and sufficient flow of promotion in the Army; that the other expedients to which resort has been had are in their nature and effects

temporary only, and that we are justified in submitting to Your Majesty that in any permanent scheme or system for sustaining promotion, retirement from the lower as well as the upper ranks is an indispensable element.

Retirements from lower ranks economical.

Objection has, we believe, been taken to this course, that it would be a great loss to the State to part with the skilled services of an officer in the prime of his life, and a further loss still to pay him to go.

But it is conceded that reasonable promotion must somehow be obtained. If the officer's services are retained he must be promoted. If he is promoted he adds to the number, already full, of the rank above, and being in excess of the regimental requirements is practically a supernumerary, with higher pay and higher rank, and a daily increasing claim in amount of pension, when the time comes at which he must perforce be either induced or compelled to retire and make way for others. Such an officer must be ultimately retired at a cost much greater than that at which the State could have parted with him at the precise time when his services really became redundant, and this, after drawing either full or half pay for many years for supernumerary work.

Meanwhile this inflation of the upper ranks beyond the needs of organisation stops the road to the rank of general officer, and tends to make the attainment of that rank impossible except at an advanced age.

We think it is clearly better to meet the difficulty of redundancy fairly at the stage at which it arises, and to recognise the fact that as the State requires a far greater number of officers in the lower than in the upper ranks, promotion is impossible for all, and retirement necessary for some.

When it is said that the State is a loser by parting with the services of an officer in middle life, the question arises in what the loss really consists.

The number of officers being fixed, the pay and expenses of the effective ranks remain the same, whether retirements are few or many. The increased charge on the State consists in the pensions of those borne on the non-effective lists. These pensions must necessarily increase in amount according to length of service; on the other hand, they are payable for a greater number of years if granted at an earlier age, and the problem to be solved is at what period of service, taking both these facts into consideration, a pension, or its commuted equivalent, will cast the lightest burthen on the public purse.

See Appendix M.

It will be found on reference to the calculations which have been made for us that the proposals we make fulfil this end, and that it is quite possible so to adjust the sums payable on retirement at an early age as to be less burthensome in the end than the higher amounts due to a longer service.

Voluntary retirement insufficient, with existing organisation to secure promotion.

Assuming then that retirements should in some way or other be effected in the captains' and subalterns' ranks, as well as the ranks above them, we now propose to consider in what way it can best be done.

And turning to the past as our guide, we find that all retirements under the Purchase System under the age of 60 were voluntary.

We should have been glad if we had seen our way to a safe result by similar means, but we think the attempt would involve an expenditure too large, and a result too uncertain.

The Purchase officer had various inducements to retire, some of which, and those the most potent, will no longer exist.

For he had a considerable sum of money constantly at stake dependent on his life, and he had to find money for the purchase of his future steps, if he were not content to lag behind in promotion; he was also daily forfeiting the interest of his money sunk in his commissions, which in the higher ranks reached a very considerable sum.

The pressure of these considerations brought about numerous retirements in all ranks, but was conspicuous in the great number of those who, soon after reaching the rank of lieutenant-colonel, either sold out and secured all their money or went on half-pay to secure their over-regulation money.

Under the existing system these inducements are withdrawn; the officer will have every inducement to stay rather than go, except in special cases where private circumstances may force him to do so, and looking to the

experience of the Artillery, we think that even a high rate of pension under a purely voluntary system cannot be relied upon to effect the object in view.

Compulsory retirements, or reorganisation necessary.

We turn therefore to the question of compulsory Retirement, not necessarily from the Army but from the regiment.

It is quite possible that if the existing organisation of the Regimental ranks of the Line were altered, either by assimilating them to those in the Artillery, or in some other way creating a greater equality in the numbers of the successive ranks than now exists, as suggested in a memorandum, handed in for our consideration, which is printed in Appendix N., the necessity for any compulsory retirement in the lower ranks might be removed. And it appears from a calculation given in Appendix O. that some re-arrangement of the kind might render the prospects of an officer on joining the service more valuable to him and even less costly to the State.

Appendix N.

Appendix O.

There are many officers, as will be seen from the evidence in the Appendix, who think that such an alteration is desirable, but opinion on this subject is by no means uniform.

See evidence of Sir Lintorn Simmons and Sir John Adye.

We have not entered upon this question as we conceive it not to be within our province to deal with it; the question referred to us being how to create the necessary promotion under the existing organisation.

We think, and the opinion is shared by most of the military authorities whom we have consulted, that it would be well if the method of compulsion could be dispensed with; and, as we shall presently show, we do not therefore propose to adopt it except as the complement of other measures, and a last resort when voluntary retirement fails.

In this aspect, and in this degree, we feel compelled to regard it as an indispensable feature in any sure scheme for the future, as constituting the only method which will place in the hands of the authorities the certain means of bringing about the necessary rate of promotion.

Nor does it involve any very wide departure from the existing state of things.

It has in principle been already adopted in the Royal Warrant of the 30th October 1871, under which, for the sake of creating promotion, the commissions of major and lieutenant-colonel are granted only for the limited period of five years.

Compulsory retirement of Captains.

We propose to go a step further and to provide that the commissions of lieutenant and captain shall only be granted for a period not together exceeding in the whole 20 years, and that at the end of that period the officer, if he has not attained promotion, shall be retired *from the regiment*. This provision, if adopted, will deal with the obstacles that stand in the way of promotion at the very point where they are chiefly felt, namely, in passing from the rank of captain to that of major, and it is on this provision that we mainly place reliance for effecting the objects in view.

Any such retirement must of course be accompanied by a pension, either permanent or temporary, or a lump sum of money, and the amount of this sum, forming as it does the starting point or standard from which the other retirements we shall recommend have in great measure been calculated, has engaged our serious attention.

Several precedents present themselves:—

1. The retirement granted in the Navy varies in accordance with the length of the officer's "sea service"; but, subject to an addition of 10*l.* for every year's "sea service" in excess of 17, and to a corresponding reduction if the "sea service" is less than 17 years, the amount to which an officer is entitled at the age of 40 is 200*l.* a year.
2. The earliest retirement in the Marines is at 22 years' service, but the amount of the annual pension is 225*l.*
3. The retirement in the old Indian Army, after 20 years' service, was 191*l.* a year.
4. In the Indian Staff Corps, after 20 years' service, an officer may retire on 191*l.* a year, but this is voluntary, and he has the alternative of *certain* promotion if he chooses to stay.
5. The sum recommended by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, in July 1867, for the Ordnance Corps and Royal Marines was, after 22 years' service, 250*l.* a year.

Lastly. The sum granted as a temporary expedient to a limited number of officers of the Royal Artillery by the Royal Warrant of May 1871 was, after 20 years' service, 191*l.* a year.

The sum which we propose is 200*l.* a year, or its commuted value at the age of the retiring officer at the rate of five per cent., which in ordinary cases will amount to 2,648*l.* This is rather less than "full pay," which for a captain in the Infantry of the Line amounts to 211*l.* 7*s.* 11*d.*

It is recommended to us by the above examples, and by the consideration that the State is requiring of an officer the best and most active 20 years of his life, and that it is withdrawing his means of livelihood at an age when a fresh career is not freely open to him.

One great object in the abolition of Purchase was to open the ranks of the Army to those who had limited means equally with those who were richer.

This object would probably be defeated if the sum of 200*l.* a year were reduced.

There would no doubt be plenty of men who have private means of their own ready to fill the ranks with much less prospects, but those who desired to enter the Army as a profession affording a livelihood could hardly be dismissed at the age of 40 with a less pension.

Civil employment and voluntary retirements to be offered as a means of reducing necessity for compulsion.

But, as we have already said, this compulsory retirement should be a last resort only.

There will always be a great many who from being married or from other reasons desirous of a fixed home would willingly make some sacrifice to exchange their regimental position for employment in some Government department. We think that advantage ought to be taken of these dispositions, and that the post of Regimental Paymaster, and any other appointments in the Civil Departments connected with the Army or otherwise, should be extensively offered from time to time to properly qualified regimental officers on full pay.

But we think that in all cases, especially in that of Regimental Paymasters, no officers should be appointed who have not given satisfactory proof of their competency.

We are also of opinion that employment in the Telegraph Service will both afford openings for the retirement of officers from their regiments and furnish a training for those gentlemen which might be of great military value.

There will also always be, as there always has been, a considerable body of men in the Army who from reasons very various, and sometimes very complex, are either positively desirous of quitting their profession or very willing to do so, if the means of doing it without too great a pecuniary sacrifice are given them.

And we think these means should be offered to them. In this way the number to be compulsorily retired may be very much reduced. A scale of pensions may, we find, be so arranged that the State will be a clear gainer by every such retirement that is accepted, that is to say, that the officer will be provided for at less cost than if he remained in his regiment until the period of compulsory retirement was reached.

See Appendix M.

In framing this scale an important matter has to be kept constantly in sight. If the amount of pension offered is too small in contrast with the 200*l.* a year to which the officer will be entitled if he stays on until he is compulsorily retired, there will be a direct inducement to him to stay and not to go.

On the other hand his private motives and wishes in the direction of retirement have to be thrown into the scale, and these it is next to impossible to estimate.

Their weight can only be ascertained by experience.

In this difficulty we have thought it best in the first instance and as a tentative plan to adopt the scale framed under Lord Cardwell's authority for the Artillery in May 1871. The retirements shown on this scale were all accepted, and have proved themselves, therefore, to be sufficiently high to answer their purpose, while on the other hand they bear such a relation to the pension on compulsory retirement as to withdraw any inducement to wait for that alternative.

The principles upon which we propose to proceed, therefore, are four in number: **General principles applicable to all arms.**

1. That retirements must be effected in the lower as well as the higher ranks.
2. That these retirements must be brought about or accompanied by a pension or sum of money.
3. That voluntary retirements should be stimulated by the offer of appointments in the various departments of the public service connected with the Army as well as by pensions or lump sums of money available in every rank, varying with rank and length of service.
4. That to whatever extent voluntary retirements fall short of the vacancies necessary for the required rate of promotion, compulsory retirement must be resorted to.

With these observations we humbly present to Your Majesty the following recommendations:—

INFANTRY OF THE LINE AND COLONIAL CORPS.

Officers of Infantry of the Line and Colonial Corps who have entered the Army since 1st November 1871.

Subalterns and Captains of Infantry.

1.—That regimental service in the rank of subaltern or captain be limited to a period in either or both ranks of 20 years in the whole.

That no paid retirement be given until an officer has completed eight years' service in the Army.

2.—That, on completion of eight years' service, an officer, if allowed to retire *from the Army*, be granted a lump sum, according to the following scale, which represents the commuted value of the "special pensions" offered to officers of Royal Artillery by the Royal Warrant of 31st May 1871:—

	£		£
After 8 years' service	745,	equal to a pension of	51
„ 9 „ „	873	„ „	60
„ 10 „ „	995	„ „	69
„ 11 „ „	1,133	„ „	79
„ 12 „ „	1,269	„ „	89
„ 13 „ „	1,401	„ „	99
„ 14 „ „	1,543	„ „	110
„ 15 „ „	1,698	„ „	122
„ 16 „ „	1,862	„ „	135
„ 17 „ „	2,021	„ „	148
„ 18 „ „	2,178	„ „	161
„ 19 „ „	2,357	„ „	176

3.—That captains, on completion of not less than 15 and not more than 20 years' service, be entitled to retire permanently *from their Regiments* on the half-pay of their rank, subject to the condition that they be held liable to serve the Crown in the regular or auxiliary forces, if required to do so at any time, until they have attained the age of 45; and that if they be employed in the auxiliary forces, they be allowed to receive, while training, their half-pay, in addition to any other sums to which they may be entitled as officers of the auxiliary forces, and that on attaining the age of 45 they be granted a step of honorary rank.

4.—That, at the expiration of the 20 years, an officer, if not promoted to the rank of substantive major, be required to accept one of the following alternatives:

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 200*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank, and in the case of officers who have received brevet promotion for distinguished service in the field, with the addition of half their brevet pay.

The commutation value of this pension (assuming him to have entered the service at the age of 20) would be 2,648*l.* Half the brevet pay drawn by a brevet major is 18*l.* 5*s.* a year.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with the half-pay of his rank, and the chance of employment other than regimental. Officers accepting the latter alternative to be allowed at any time after going on half-pay to retire from the Army with a pension of 200*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank.

Majors of Infantry.

5.—That a major, if allowed to retire *from the Army* before completing a total service of 23 years, be granted the same terms as captains retiring voluntarily under Recommendation 2.

6.—That a major, if retiring *from the Army* after completing 23 years' total service, be granted a pension of 250*l.* a year.

The commutation value of this (assuming as above that he entered the service at the age of 20) would be 3,186*l.*, the regulation value of a major's commission under the Purchase System being 3,200*l.*

7.—That a major, on completion of seven years' service as substantive major, and not less than 27 years' total service, if not promoted to the rank of substantive lieutenant-colonel, be required to accept one of the following alternatives :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 300*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank.

Assuming him to have entered the service at the age of 20, and to have served 27 years, the commutation value of this would be 3,577*l.*

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with a step of unattached promotion, and with the chance of employment other than regimental.

The half-pay of a lieutenant-colonel of Infantry is 200*l.* 15*s.* a year.

Lieutenant-colonels of Infantry.

8.—That lieutenant-colonels, if allowed to retire *from the Army* with less than 27 years' service, be granted the same terms as majors retiring voluntarily under Recommendation 6.

9.—That lieutenant-colonels, if allowed to retire within five years of the date of their promotion to the rank, but with not less than 27 years' total service, be granted the choice of the following alternatives :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 300*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with half-pay, and the chance of employment other than regimental.

C.—On completing 30 years' total service *retirement from the Army* with a pension of 365*l.* a year, being the amount of the present full pay retirement, and a step of honorary rank. The pension to carry with it the right to a widow's pension.

In the case of the retirement under alternatives A or C of officers holding the brevet rank of colonel, the honorary rank of major-general should be conferred from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service.

(The commutation values of A. and B. are as follows :—

—	A. 300*l.* a Year.	B. Lieutenant-colonel's Half-pay (Infantry), 200*l.* 15*s.*
	£	£
At the age of 45	3,708	2,481
„ 46	3,644	2,438
„ 47	3,577	2,394
„ 48	3,507	2,347
„ 49	3,436	2,299
„ 50	3,364	2,251
„ 51	3,294	2,204
„ 52	3,225	2,158

As regards lieutenant-colonels who have completed five years' service with their regiments, and who should then be removed from their regiments, our proposals will be found in Recommendation 33.

The foregoing recommendations and those which follow are not intended to be applicable to paymasters or quartermasters, nor to any non-combatant officers.

As regards their application to officers who may have risen from the ranks, we recommend that the system which existed under Purchase be adopted, and that half their service in the ranks be reckoned as commissioned service in calculating all periods both for voluntary and compulsory retirements.

Officers promoted from ranks.

PURCHASE OFFICERS.

Introductory remarks.

We now turn to the "Purchase Officers," that is to say, those officers who entered the Army before Purchase was abolished; they are by far the larger part of the officers in the larger part of the present Army.

Some diagrams will be found in the Appendix which exhibit the condition of the Guards, Household Cavalry, and Cavalry and Infantry of the Line on the 1st July 1875, and show how many of the officers who entered the Army before November 1871 had then been promoted in each grade since that period, how many remained in the rank which they occupied in November 1871, and how many had joined the Army since then and were still sub-lieutenants.

Appendices F., F. 1, F. 2, and F. 3.

Any scheme of retirement which did not affect "Purchase Officers" would be a scheme for the future only, and could not take effect for many years to come. In the meantime the "assurance of Your Majesty's responsible minister," referred to in our Commission, that "a reasonable rapidity of "promotion, not differing essentially from that which obtained before the "abolition of Purchase, should be maintained for the future," would not be fulfilled.

On the other hand, we are directed, in framing the means for securing the necessary "rapidity of promotion," to do so "with justice to the officers of "all ranks in those corps which were under the Purchase System."

Officers promoted since abolition of Purchase subject to new rules.

We think that the above regulations, which we propose as a permanent system for the future, cannot with justice be applied *in their integrity* to the Purchase officers.

We have therefore considered to what extent and in what cases these regulations can be fairly and justly applied, as they stand, to the Purchase officers, and with what modifications they may be justly made to apply in other cases; and we have come to the conclusion that no Purchase officers who have been or may be promoted at any time since the abolition of Purchase can claim exemption from any new regulations affecting the rank to which they may have been so promoted, which for the good of the service it may be determined to adopt or impose.

This principle has been already to some extent acted upon by the Royal Warrant limiting the tenure of majorities and lieutenant-colonelcies to the period of five years, which has been applied indiscriminately to all officers appointed to those ranks since Purchase was abolished.

We think the principle a just one, and that those who receive a new commission must take it subject to the regulations by which its incidents are governed.

But what is to be said of those officers who still hold the same commissions which they held, and in most cases paid for, before Purchase was abolished?

They are a very numerous class. They stand as a rule at the head of each rank, and if they are not moved forward or retired promotion must stagnate. From no fault of their own, but owing solely to the changes which have been made whereby promotion has been impeded, they have many of them reached an age at which it is not desirable that they should now go forward to fill the higher ranks of the Army.

But if not promoted how are they to be dealt with?

Can they be retired upon any voluntary system?

Tendency of recent changes, and of proposals of Commission on Officers' Memorials, to induce officers to remain in the service.

We have felt much difficulty in dealing with this part of the subject. The truth is that the circumstances which attended and followed the abolition of Purchase have in this respect created a position of much embarrassment.

For these officers have been assured that in some way or other the previous rate of promotion should be maintained. They have also been relieved of the necessity of paying for any future steps. These two securities must inevitably act strongly to induce them to wait for promotion, stay where they are, and not retire. Moreover, the Officers' Memorials Commissioners, who were not

charged with the duty or invested with the power of inquiring into the proper means for securing retirement or promotion, have recommended certain sums to be added to the claims of the Purchase officers of Infantry when they retire.

But these additional advantages are recommended *only* for those who may have *actually obtained promotion* since Purchase was abolished, the Commissioners being of opinion that those only who actually obtained promotion would be losers by not being allowed on retirement to sell their newly acquired steps.

This operates as a further inducement against retirement until promotion has been attained. With these inducements to remain, the only inducements to retire are to be found in the private circumstances attending each individual case, coupled with the desire to secure their Purchase money, now lying idle and dependent on the chances of life and death.

The result of these opposite inducements on the will of individual officers it is impossible to forecast with any precision, and the difficulty of approaching a probable result is further complicated by the fact that the experience of the last four years is not to be relied upon, because many are probably waiting before they retire to see what the State will do for them.

Terms offered by Army Regulation Act insufficient to secure retirements necessary.

Still it is clear to us that the terms offered to those officers by the Act of 1871 will fall far short of creating the necessary vacancies, and that recourse must be had to some further method of expediting retirement among them.

In considering and determining what these means ought to be we have been obliged to bear in mind the recommendation of the late Royal Commission on the Officers' Memorials. The only question which was referred to that Commission concerned the interests of the individual officers, and the degree in which those interests were affected by the Royal Warrant abolishing Purchase. Their recommendations consequently took the form of a pecuniary recompense, calculated and adjusted as far as practicable to the loss supposed to be incurred by them. Promotion and the means of procuring it were only so far considered by that Commission, that the compensation they suggested was deferred until the officer actually retired. But while this provision would, if adopted, operate as an inducement to the officer to retire when promoted, another recommendation of the same Commission that the compensation should be paid only to those *who had obtained promotion, and had served five years in their new rank*, would operate most strongly as an inducement not to retire until that promotion had been attained and that service completed.

Necessity for altering proposals of Commission on Officers' Memorials.

To us, who are charged with the duty of providing promotion which can only be procured through retirement, it is evident that the recommendations of the late Commission cannot be carried into effect without unduly impeding that very retirement, and that the just interests of the officers must be secured in some other way.

In place, therefore, of the additional advantages recommended by the late Commission to be given to the few who might stay on to secure promotion, we shall propose advantages to be more widely distributed over the whole body of officers, and obtainable on retirement without promotion.

In the rank of subaltern there is not much difficulty in doing this, for the retirements which we have recommended as proper to secure promotion in the future will, if offered to all the officers who held the rank of ensign, cornet, or lieutenant in November 1871, give them greater advantages than the late Commission awarded to them in respect of their injured prospects.

But in the rank of captain it is different; the sums to which the officers in this rank are entitled under the Act passed on the abolition of Purchase (representing, in most cases, money which they have already paid) are in many instances larger than the retirements which we have proposed for the future, and the scale of these retirements cannot therefore be applied to them without injustice.

The number of those who were captains at the time when Purchase was abolished is very considerable; it is among them that we find promotion to have chiefly stagnated since that time, and the result of this stagnation has been, as already stated, that many of them are so far advanced in age that it is not desirable that they should now find their way into the higher ranks.

For the double purpose then of doing justice to the interests of these officers, and of procuring the necessary promotion, we are of opinion that some temporary measure is required by which their position on retirement may be improved, and retirement thereby stimulated among them.

In the rank of major and lieutenant-colonel we see no reason for the adoption of any exceptional methods to induce retirement for the purposes of promotion, but on the other hand the injury to the prospects of those in the rank of major which the late Commission thought required compensation in the case of officers of Infantry must not be lost sight of.

In this case as in the case of the captains we think it will be mischievous and injurious to promotion if this compensation is given only to those who stay on in the regiment until they gain their next step, and we shall propose a substitute for it which will avoid this evil.

General principles applicable to officers who joined before abolition of Purchase.

The two principles, therefore, which we propose for adoption in dealing with the Purchase officers are the following :—

A.—That officers who obtained their present regimental rank before the abolition of Purchase should not, while in that rank, be subjected to any obligation to retire from the Army or resign their chances of promotion to the rank above them without some reasonable compensation being offered to them.

B.—That, on the other hand, officers who have been or shall be promoted to a higher regimental rank since the abolition of Purchase cannot claim exemption from any new rules affecting that higher rank.

The following are the recommendations which we submit to Your Majesty in respect of these officers :—

Appendix P.

It will be seen from a calculation printed in the Appendix that, although differing in their incidence from the proposals made by the Royal Commission on the Officers' Memorials, they are not less beneficial to the officers concerned as a body.

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO CAPTAINS OF INFANTRY OF THE LINE AND COLONIAL CORPS WHO HAD OBTAINED THAT RANK BEFORE PURCHASE WAS ABOLISHED.

Captains of Infantry.

10.—That they be ineligible for regimental promotion after completing 25 years' total service.

We are aware that this recommendation may have a stringent operation, and may exclude from further regimental promotion some officers whose services have been distinguished and valuable, and we think that in such cases the military authorities should for a limited time be empowered to relax the rule; but that whenever this is done, the grounds of such relaxation should be recorded in a special official minute.

11.—That those who shall have served between 12 and 20 years be allowed to retire *from the Regiment* on the half-pay of their rank, and that a sum of money be paid to them on such retirement equal to the over-regulation money or "bonus" now payable to them on going on half-pay under the provisions of the Army Regulation Act; and, further, that an addition of half their brevet pay be made to the half-pay of such of them as may hold the brevet rank of major.

Half the brevet pay drawn by a brevet major is 18*l.* 5*s.* a year.

12.—That the above retirement be subject to the condition that the officer accepting it shall, while on half-pay, be liable to serve the Crown in the regular or auxiliary forces, if required to do so, at any time until he has attained the age of 45, and that if employed in the auxiliary forces, he be allowed to receive, while training, his half-pay, in addition to any other sums to which he may be entitled as an officer of the auxiliary forces, and further that every officer so retiring shall, if still on half-pay, be entitled, on attaining the age of 45, to a step of honorary rank.

13.—That any officer who has accepted the above retirement be at any time allowed to retire *from the Army* altogether, and on retiring receive the sum to which he may be entitled under the Army Regulation Act, minus his over-regulation money or "bonus."

14.—That on completing 20 years' service they be offered either of the following alternatives for their voluntary acceptance :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension to be calculated according to age, so as to be worth at the time of the officer's retirement, at the Government commutation rate, the sum of 3,200*l.* This pension to carry with it, as in the cases of full-pay retirement as now regulated, a widow's pension and a step of honorary rank, but in no case to exceed 259*l.* which is the amount corresponding to the age of 45.

B. — *Retirement from the Regiment* with an unattached majority, and the right to receive on retirement from the Army the sum of 3,200*l.*

This sum, which was the regulation price of a major's commission under Purchase, is 800*l.* in excess of the amount to which the officers are now on an average entitled under the Army Regulation Act.

An officer accepting either of these alternatives to accept it in lieu of his existing rights under the Army Regulation Act.

The following are the annuities which, at the Government commutation rates, represent 3,200*l.* at the ages stated :—

At the age of—

38 (that is in the officer's 39th year)	£236
39	239
40	242
41	245
42	248
43	251
44	255
45	259

15.—That such of them as may on the 1st January immediately following the introduction of the new scheme of retirement have completed 25 years' service be permitted to retire *from the Army* on pensions calculated according to their age, so as to be worth to each of such officers on that day the sum of 3,200*l.* These pensions to carry with them the advantages attached to the pensions to be conferred under Recommendation 14 A.

The following are the Annuities :

At the age of—

46	£263
47	268
48	274
49	280
50	285
51	291
52	298
53	304
54	311
55	318

Recommendations with regard to Majors of Infantry of the Line and Colonial Corps who had obtained that Rank before the Abolition of Purchase.

Majors of Infantry.

16.—That on completing 25 years' service they be offered either of the following alternatives for their voluntary acceptance :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension equal to their full pay, with the right to receive the sum or sums of money to which they would have been entitled under the Army Regulation Act as over-regulation money or "bonus" on retirement on full pay after 30 years' service.

This pension to carry with it, as in the case of retirement on full pay as now regulated, a widow's pension and a step of honorary rank.

The full pay of a major of Infantry is 292*l.* a year.

The commuted value of this is—

At the age of

	£
42 (that is in the officer's 43rd year)	3,773
43	3,722
44	3,667
45	3,609
46	3,547

The average "bonus" allowed to a major of Infantry retiring on full pay is 1,960*l.*

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with an unattached lieutenant-colonelcy, and the chance of employment other than regimental, and a right to receive on retirement from the Army a sum of 4,500*l.*

This sum, which was the regulation value of a lieutenant-colonel's commission under Purchase, is rather less than the officers are now on an average entitled to under the Army Regulation Act.

The half-pay of a lieutenant-colonel of Infantry is 200*l.* 15*s.*

An officer accepting the latter alternative (B.) to abandon any right he may now have to receive over-regulation money or "bonus."

We also recommend with reference to this class of officers—

17.—That such of them as may have been or may be promoted to the rank of substantive lieutenant-colonel and are removed from their regiments after five years' service as lieutenant-colonels should, if placed on half-pay, be entitled to count such service on half-pay as full-pay service towards making up the 30 years' service which will qualify them to retire on full-pay if and when the state of the full-pay retirement list admits of it. But if they avail themselves of this permission they should not claim or receive the over-regulation price of their commissions or any bonus under the provisions of the Act until they actually retire on full pay.

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO LIEUTENANT-COLONELS OF INFANTRY OF THE LINE AND COLONIAL CORPS WHO HAVE OBTAINED THAT RANK BEFORE PURCHASE WAS ABOLISHED.

Lieutenant-colonels of Infantry.

18.—That regimental lieutenant-colonels on full pay, who had attained that rank before the abolition of Purchase, on reaching the age of 52, be offered *retirement from the Army* on 600*l.* a year, with a step of honorary rank, from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service.

The commutation value of this at the age of 52 would be 6,450*l.* This is rather less than the average regulation and over-regulation values of the commission of a lieutenant-colonel of Infantry, which is 6,935*l.*

We further recommend that all Purchase officers be allowed to take advantage of the Voluntary Retirements which we have proposed for the Army of the future, if so disposed, in lieu of their claims under the Army Regulation Act.

The officers to whom the foregoing recommendations (10 to 18) apply are now entitled—

1. To retire at any time from the Army, receiving from the Army Purchase Commissioners the regulation and over-regulation value of their commissions. These, in the Infantry, are on an average—

	£	s.	d.
For Captains	2,414	0	0
Majors	4,689	0	0
Lieut.-Colonels	6,935	0	0

2. On completing 25 years' service, to retire from their regiments on the half-pay of their rank, which is in the Infantry—

	£	s.	d.
For Captains	127	15	0
Or if Brevet-Majors	146	0	0
Majors	173	7	6
Lieut.-Colonels	200	15	0

In this case they can receive, on going on half-pay, from the Army Purchase Commissioners, the over-regulation values of their commissions, which in the Infantry are on an average—

	£	s.	d.
For Captains	614	0	0
Majors	1,489	0	0
Lieut.-Colonels	2,435	0	0

3. On completing 30 years' service, to retire from the Army within certain limits, on "full-pay retirement," vizt.:—

	£	s.	d.
For Captains	211	7	11
Or if Brevet-Majors	247	17	11
Majors	292	0	0
Lieut.-Colonels, 1*l.* a day.			

In this case they are now allowed to receive the "bonus" which it was customary to give in their regiments under similar circumstances when Purchase was in force. This is on an average in the Infantry of Line— See Appendix Q.

	£	s.	d.
For Captains	831	0	0
Majors	1,960	0	0
Lieut.-Colonels	3,225	0	0

General observations regarding Purchase officers.

In framing these proposals in respect of the Purchase officers we are aware that it may, and probably will, be urged as a hardship upon those who stand high up in the rank of captain that by restricting their promotion we are in some degree enforcing their retirement.

But we have found ourselves in this difficulty. Unless considerable retirements are effected (in the captain's rank especially) the promotion which has been promised to the Army cannot possibly be given. The choice therefore lies between stagnation in promotion and a sufficient amount of retirement obtained by some means or other. In this choice we have not hesitated to accept the conclusion that the general welfare of the whole body of officers must prevail over the desires or interests of individuals, subject to this condition, that a reasonably liberal provision should be made for the individuals who are called upon to make any sacrifice for the purpose. The annuities we have proposed for those thus placed vary according to length of service from 240*l.* to 259*l.* a year, being considerably more than the full pay of their rank, which is only 211*l.*, and represent a capital value of 3,200*l.*, whereas their present rights on retirement are represented by little more than 2,400*l.*, while for those who have already completed 25 years' service these annuities range as high as 311*l.* We have further proposed that the step of honorary rank and widow's pension, which usually accompany full-pay retirement, should be accorded to these officers.

With these inducements it may be thought that voluntary retirements might be relied upon to produce the needful vacancies; but we think the State ought not to be asked to incur this considerable expense without the certainty that the object of it would be effected.

There are always a number of individuals ready to retire for reasons of their own; many have done so since Purchase was abolished, with no other pecuniary inducements than the Army Regulation Act offered them, and many are no doubt prepared to do so now. It would hardly be satisfactory if these new and additional pecuniary benefits which we have proposed should turn out, on a purely voluntary system, to have been accepted only by those who were already prepared to leave the Army without them; and that the additional retirements which it is the main object of the expenditure to secure should never have been brought about at all.

This consideration it is which renders a possible resort to compulsion in some form or degree a necessity; and if it should turn out that the restriction which we have proposed to place on Promotion after a certain length of service falls short of its object, we do not hesitate to recommend that a sufficient number of officers should on the same terms be compulsorily retired, if not from the Army, at least from the Regiment.

It is not our intention to recommend that any of the pecuniary benefits on retirement whether from the Army or from the Regiment, which are now open to the officers who entered the service before the 1st November 1871 should be taken away or altered.

But in all cases in which an officer elects to accept any of the retirements which we have proposed for the officers entering the Army after the 1st November 1871, he will not be entitled to any of the above benefits.

No officers who on retiring on half-pay may have received "over-regulation" money should afterwards be allowed to exchange their half-pay for the larger pensions proposed for other officers of their rank, excepting those removed from their regiments on completing five years' service as substantive lieutenant-colonels, whose cases are specially provided for in Recommendation 33, &c.

It remains only to state that these voluntary retirements, like those which we have proposed for the future Army, should be permitted only at the discretion of the military authorities, save only in the case of any captains who may have been passed over for promotion by reason of their having completed 25 years' service.

GUARDS, HOUSEHOLD CAVALRY, AND CAVALRY OF THE LINE.

Introductory Remarks.

We have been informed by His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief that the future organisation of the Guards will probably be the same as of battalions of the Line, and we accordingly recommend that, whenever this may be the case, all officers of the Guards who have entered the service since the abolition of Purchase should be subject to the same rules and regulations as to promotion and retirement as officers of the Infantry of the Line.

These Recommendations will also apply equally to officers of the Household Cavalry and Cavalry of the Line who have entered the Service or who have been promoted since the abolition of Purchase.

But as the present constitution of the Guards is in many ways different from the Line, more especially as regards the class of officers known as "mounted officers," a class which exists only in the Guards and has no parallel in other regiments, but which may be described as regimental captains with superior Army rank doing majors' duties, and as we are not informed how soon or in what manner any changes of organisation may be carried out, we feel considerable difficulty in making any complete recommendations as regard the officers who entered the service before the abolition of Purchase.

The general principles by which we have been guided in framing our proposals in regard to the Purchase officers of the Line, are, in the main, equally applicable to officers of the Guards; but the Commissioners on Officers' Memorials having expressed their opinion that the losses involved by the abolition of Purchase are in the case of the Guards, Household Cavalry, and Cavalry of the Line, counterbalanced by the gains of the officers under the new system, the only point which we have felt it our duty to consider in framing our recommendations in regard to the "Purchase Officers" in these branches of the service is the manner in which the retirements necessary to secure the required promotion may be obtained with due consideration to the officers.

We therefore submit to Your Majesty the following—

Recommendations with regard to Officers of the Foot Guards.

Regimental officers of Foot Guards.

19.—That all officers on completing 25 years' service be entitled as at present to retire from the regiment on half-pay, with the chance of employment other than regimental, receiving any sums to which they may now be entitled as "over-regulation money" under the provisions of the Army Regulation Act.

20.—That regimental lieutenant-colonelcies and regimental majorities, the latter of which involve the commands of battalions, be held (in the case of officers promoted to those ranks since the abolition of Purchase) for five years only.

21.—That officers who held the rank of regimental captains before the abolition of Purchase, and who now hold it, be allowed to retain their present positions until promoted or retired under the rules now in force.

22.—That such officers be considered ineligible to succeed to the command of a battalion after completing 30 years' service.

That on completing 30 years' service they be allowed to retire *from the Army* with a pension of 450*l.* a year. The pension to carry with it the following additional advantages:—

1. The over-regulation money to which the officer would now be entitled on retiring on half-pay.
2. A step of honorary rank. In the case of a brevet colonel the grant of the step of rank not to be made until such time as he would have obtained the rank had he remained in the service.
3. A right to widow's pension.

23.—That officers who held the rank of regimental lieutenant before the abolition of Purchase, and who shall be, or may have been since promoted to the rank of regimental captain, on completing 20 years' service, if not then "mounted officers," be required to accept one of the following alternatives:—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 250*l.* a year and a step of honorary rank.

The commuted value of 250*l.* a year at the age of 40 is 3,310*l.* The sum which officers who held the rank of regimental lieutenant in the Guards before the abolition of Purchase can now receive is, on an average, 2,967*l.*

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with half-pay, and the chance of employment other than regimental, and with a right to receive, on going to half-pay, the over-regulation money due to them under the Army Regulation Act.

24.—That, subject to these provisions, the retirements and regulations proposed for officers of the Line who have entered the Army, or who have been promoted in it, since the abolition of Purchase be applied to the officers of the Guards in similar positions.

General officers of Foot Guards.

In submitting to Your Majesty the above recommendations which apply to the Guards, we desire to point out that so long as the existing organisation of these Regiments, including the mode of qualifying for the rank of colonel, is maintained, there must be great inequality with the officers of the Line in respect of advancement to the rank of general officer, unless, either the Guards system is modified, or a separate establishment of general officers is provided for the Guards.

Recommendations in regard to Officers of Cavalry of the Line.

Captains of Cavalry of Line.

25.—That captains who had obtained that rank before the abolition of Purchase be ineligible for promotion after completing 25 years' total service.

26.—That, after 20 years' service, they be offered either of the following alternatives for their voluntary acceptance :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a step of honorary rank, and any sum they may now be entitled to as over-regulation money, and a pension of 180*l.* a year.

The pension to carry with it the right to a widow's pension.

At the age of 40, the pension representing 1,800*l.*, the amount which the officer will leave in the hands of the Government, would, at Government commutation rate, be 136*l.*; at 45 it would be 145*l.*

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with unattached majorities, with a right, on accepting the step, to receive the amount of the over-regulation value of their captains' commissions.

Officers accepting this alternative to have the chance of employment other than regimental, and to be entitled on retirement from the Army to receive the regulation value of their captain's commission.

Majors and lieutenant colonels of Cavalry of Line.

As regards majors and lieutenant-colonels of Cavalry who held those ranks before the abolition of Purchase, we do not consider it necessary to make any special recommendations.

These officers are now entitled to receive from the Army Purchase Commissioners sums so considerable that we do not feel ourselves justified in proposing that any terms more advantageous than those which are now open to them under the provisions of the Army Regulation Act should be offered to them. The rate of promotion, moreover, which has obtained in these ranks in the Cavalry since the abolition of Purchase has not, we consider, been such as to call for any exceptional treatment.

Recommendations with regard to Officers of the Household Cavalry.

Captains of Household Cavalry.

27.—That captains who had obtained that rank before the abolition of Purchase be ineligible for promotion after completing 25 years' service, and after completing 20 years be offered either of the following alternatives for voluntary acceptance :—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a step of honorary rank, receiving the sum to which they may now be entitled as regulation and over-regulation, subject to a deduction of 1,800*l.*, and with a pension of 180*l.* a year. The pension to carry with it a right to widow's pension.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with an unattached majority, with the right, on accepting the step, to receive whatever sum they may now be entitled to as regulation and over-regulation, with a deduction of 1,800*l.*

Officers accepting this alternative to have the chance of employment other than regimental, and to be entitled on retirement from the Army to receive 1,800*l.*

These proposals are, it will be seen, based upon those contained in Recommendations 25 and 26 relating to officers similarly situated in the Cavalry of the Line.

Captains of Household Cavalry and Cavalry of the Line who obtained that rank before the abolition of Purchase will thus have the same four alternatives open to them:—

a. To continue serving until obliged to retire under existing rules; but without chance of promotion after completing 25 years' service.

b. To sell out, receiving what they are now entitled to under the Army Regulation Act.

If they wait until they have completed 20 years' service, *i.e.*, until they are within five years of the period at which they would become ineligible for further promotion, they will have as further alternatives,—

c. *Retirement from the Regiment* with an unattached majority, receiving whatever sums they can now claim under the Army Regulation Act, minus 1,800*l.*

d. *Retirement from the Army* with a step of honorary rank, and receiving whatever sums they can now claim under the Army Regulation Act, minus 1,800*l.*, and a pension of 180*l.* a year.

In the case of the retirement of an officer holding brevet rank as colonel, under alternatives A. of Recommendations 23, 26, or 27, the honorary rank of major-general should be conferred from the date at which it would have accrued to him had he remained in the service.

STAFF OFFICERS.

The following are the—

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REGARD TO OFFICERS SERVING ON THE STAFF,

which we have to submit to Your Majesty.

Staff officers.

28.—That all officers appointed to the Staff be seconded, and, with the following exceptions, rejoin their regiments on completion of their Staff service:—

29.—That captains who have completed 20 years' service be compulsorily retired *from their Regiments* on completion of their Staff service, on the same terms as those proposed for regimental captains in Recommendation 4.

30.—That majors who have held the substantive rank of major for seven years, and have served in all not less than 27 years, be compulsorily retired *from their Regiments* on completion of their Staff service, on the same terms as those proposed for regimental majors in Recommendation 7.

31.—That all captains and majors appointed to the Staff, be allowed to complete their five years' tenure of staff employment without reference to their length of service.

32.—That lieutenant-colonels on appointment to the Staff be struck off their regiments, and do not return.

GENERAL OFFICERS AND BREVET COLONELS.

Introductory remarks.

Having thus dealt with the various grades of regimental rank, and stated our proposals, we pass on to the subject of the establishment of general officers.

The system of a fixed establishment of general officers, limited to an arbitrary number, with its moderate pay and its prizes of regimental colonelcies, has been, in great measure, the accidental growth of time and traditional practice.

It does not appear to us to be founded on any systematic basis. At the same time we find that it is not unpopular, and that the prizes in the shape of regimental colonelcies are conferred with so uniform an impartiality as to operate as rewards for really meritorious service coupled with seniority.

While, therefore, we are by no means satisfied that the entire system at present in existence for providing officers to fill the superior commands of the Army on the one hand, and for rewarding past services on the other, may not be open to the objections which have been in some quarters urged against it, we have thought it best to confine our recommendations to the best mode of improvement rather than the destruction of that system.

The establishment, and the rules which govern it, do not to any great extent affect regimental promotion, for those who have qualified for it will, according to our previous proposals, pass away from their regiments at the end of their five-year commands, and having given a step will cease to influence regimental promotion. But this system of quitting the regimental command at the end of every five years, which indeed is the system at present in force under the Warrant of 30th October 1871, and which we recommend to be continued, will in every year add as many as 36 to the list of brevet colonels, who will be waiting for their turn to succeed to the fixed establishment of general officers.

See Appendix R.

The result will be that in course of time, when the system is in full operation, there will be, if no cause is set in action to reduce them, a number of not less than 523 brevet colonels of the Guards and Line on the Half-Pay List waiting for the step of major-general.

Employment can only be found for a limited number of the officers so placed; they would on the average, we find, have probably thirteen years and a half or more to pass unemployed on half-pay, and would not reach the general officers' rank until an age on the average of 64 years.

In whatever aspect this state of things is regarded we think it most unsatisfactory.

The great and salient evil which would result from it is that instead of having a succession of men entering the grade of general officer at an age on the average sufficiently young to discharge the active duties of military command, the grade of general would, in the majority of cases, become a mere reward for faithful service in the past.

And even in those cases in which the rank should be attained at a sufficiently early age, the efficiency of the individual officer would be seriously impaired by his period of enforced idleness and withdrawal from military life.

This disadvantage, great at all times, is especially so at the present day, when changes in arms, tactics, strategy, and all the other details of war are constantly occurring.

Questions 3897, &c.

We have received a very marked and most valuable opinion to this effect from His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, an opinion in which we entirely concur.

But the remedy for this evil is not easily found.

It must be borne in mind in seeking it, that any measure by means of which the Brevet Colonel is brought forward to a place on the general officers' establishment sooner than he would be under existing rules, involves his passing so many years on the full pay of a general officer which he would otherwise have passed on half-pay as a colonel, and consequently entails a very heavy expense on the State.

This expense would not be lessened, but increased if, instead of providing for the early accession of all colonels to the establishment, a sufficient number of them to effect the same end were induced or compelled to retire from the army and thus make way for the rest, inasmuch as their retirements, whether compulsory or voluntary, must be accompanied by a pension even more onerous to the State than an increase of the general officers' establishment.

It is also to be remembered that the establishment of general officers is not intended to fulfil the sole purpose of providing officers capable of taking the field in high commands on Active Service, and that the advanced age which is eminently undesirable in the case of officers called to active commands in the field is no disqualification for many commands in time of peace, and still less so for a step conferred as a reward only for long service.

It would be erroneous, therefore, to regard the establishment as if it were composed only of officers who were intended for active service and to require that all who entered it should do so at an age early enough to be a guarantee of fitness for such service.

This double purpose of the establishment was recognised and much insisted upon in the Report to your Majesty made under the Commission on Promotion in the Army, issued in 1854, to which we crave leave to refer, and, bearing it in mind, we do not think that we should be justified in recommending the application of compulsory retirement to the rank of Brevet Colonel, or that any fixed age should be determined upon after which a Brevet Colonel should not acceed to the general officers' establishment.

The need for any such general rule of exclusion as we have proposed for other ranks does not, for the above reasons, exist in this.

At the same time we think that measures should be taken to diminish the period of thirteen years and a half, or perhaps even more, which would, as matters now stand, intervene between the expiration of regimental command and accession to the general officer's establishment.

The extent to which this diminution should be pushed, is in some measure a question of expense; but on the whole we recommend that a Brevet Colonel should not on the average pass more than eight years after leaving his regiment before he becomes a general officer.

Retired List of General Officers.

What we, therefore, propose is that a number of the oldest general officers should be from time to time removed from the fixed establishment to a second or "*Retired*" List, retaining their rank, their emoluments, and their eligibility for colonelcies of regiments, and that the places thus vacated on the fixed establishment should be filled in the ordinary way from the list of brevet colonels.

The age which should be fixed for this removal must be to a great extent a matter of experience.

We believe that if the age of 70 were fixed upon as a first experiment it would, with the further proposal which we are about to make, achieve the object.

Voluntary retirements for brevet colonels.

That further proposal is that a pension of 420*l.* a year should be offered to brevet colonels at the completion of their five years' command, on condition of their retiring from the Army.

This sum of 420*l.* a year is somewhat less than the pay of a major-general, which is 456*l.* a year, but it is attainable immediately on quitting the command of a regiment, and may, we think, with the other advantages which we propose, be accepted by many.

We further hope that this offer will act in some sort as a balance regulating the rate of promotion to the rank of major-general, and securing the attainment of that rank at a sufficiently early age, and after the lapse of a sufficiently short period.

For the pension will probably be more freely taken when promotion is slack, and the intervening period on half-pay seems likely to be long, and cease to be taken at all when the prospect of becoming a major-general seems near at hand.

The following are, therefore, our—

Recommendations with regard to General Officers and Brevet Colonels completing Five Years' Service with Regiments or on the Staff.

Brevet colonels completing five years with regiments.

33.—That brevet colonels, on completion of five years' service as substantive lieutenant-colonels with their regiments, or on the Staff, be required to accept one of the following alternatives:—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 420*l.*, in addition to any good service pension of which they may be in enjoyment, with the honorary rank of major-general, from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service. This alternative to remain open for acceptance at any time before the officer's promotion to the rank of major-general.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with half-pay, and the chance of Staff employment, and succession to the establishment of general officers.

As regards officers who entered the service before the 1st November 1871, we propose that any who may accept alternative B. of Recommendation 33 should be allowed on going to half-pay to receive the over-regulation value of the commission they held when purchase was abolished.

In such cases, however, the officer should not be allowed to exchange his half-pay for the pension of 420*l.* granted under alternative A. until he has reached the age of 55.

The commutation values of A. and B. are as follows :—

—	A. 420*l.* a Year.	B. Lieutenant-colonel's Half-pay (Infantry), 200*l.* 15*s.*
	£	£
At the age of 45 -	5,192	2,481
„ 46 -	5,102	2,438
„ 47 -	5,008	2,394
„ 48 -	4,910	2,347
„ 49 -	4,811	2,299
„ 50 -	4,710	2,251
„ 51 -	4,612	2,204
„ 52 -	4,515	2,158

Brevet colonels now on half-pay.

34.—That all colonels at present on half-pay, who are qualified to succeed to the fixed establishment of general officers, be permitted on reaching the age of 55 to retire on a pension of 420*l.* a year, with a step of honorary rank, from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service.

The commutation value of 420*l.* a year at the age of 55 is 4,235*l.*

Supposing the officer on half-pay to have been a lieut.-colonel when Purchase was abolished, he can now obtain from the Army Purchase Commissioners on retirement 4,500*l.*, and if then a major, 3,200*l.*

We further recommend,—

General officers.

35. That the establishment of general officers of the Guards and Line remain, as fixed by the Royal Warrant of the 27th December 1870, 275; and that on reaching a fixed age, officers be removed from it to a "retired" list, and their places filled by the promotion of colonels.

That the age for the removal of general officers to the "retired" list, be fixed for the present at 70, to be altered, should experience prove a change to be desirable.

Whether the system of a retired list of general officers which we have thus proposed above, should be introduced in its entirety at once, or gradually, must be for the consideration of Your Majesty's advisers.

Exceptions to five years' rule.

Although we have recommended that the "five-year rule" should be applied generally to all lieutenant-colonels, including, as will be seen hereafter, those of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, we are aware that there may be instances in which its rigid application would be disadvantageous to the public, and we recommend that where this is clearly the case special exceptions should be made.

In the case, for instance, of an officer serving with his regiment abroad, and who may complete five years in command within a few months of the time fixed for the return of the regiment to England, it might be, and probably would be, desirable to extend his term of service for a short time.

ROYAL ARTILLERY.

Introductory remarks.

The regiment of Royal Artillery is organised differently from the regiments of the Line, and has received promotion by different methods, and upon a different system from those which have been in force for the rest of the Army. This consideration makes it undesirable that its system of promotion should, at least for the present, be entirely assimilated to that proposed for the other arms of the service. To do so would involve changes of organisation, which we do not consider to fall within our cognizance. At the same time we consider that the principle of procuring retirements in the lower as well as the higher ranks is equally applicable here as elsewhere, and that compulsory retirement in some degree will have to be resorted to, if the standard periods of promotion are to be sustained.

At the present time promotion, though more slack than it has been, cannot be said to be notably in arrear.

The senior major in the Royal Artillery has 25½ years' service, the senior captain about 20 years' service, and the senior lieutenant 13 years,

But before long several batches of officers entering the service on or about the same date will come forward to the head of the rank, and stagnation will be the necessary result.

The condition of promotion in this arm of the service has been lately and elaborately considered by the Select Committee of the House of Commons which sat, under the presidency of Mr. Childers, in 1867, and by a Departmental Committee which sat at the War Office in 1870, under the presidency of Mr. Vivian, now the Permanent Under Secretary of State for War. The facts and opinions recorded in the reports of these Committees make it unnecessary for us to enter into the details of the causes by which the existing state of things has been brought about.

On this head we call attention to a Report of the Actuaries which appears in the Appendix of our Report, and without further remark proceed to lay before Your Majesty the following— Appendix L. (Part 1).

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO OFFICERS OF THE ROYAL ARTILLERY.

36.—That officers, of whatever rank, after completing eight years' service, be permitted to retire with a lump sum according to the scale proposed for officers of Infantry under Recommendation 2. **Subalterns, captains, and majors of Royal Artillery.**

When these retirements were offered to the Royal Artillery in 1871 the number of officers who applied to retire, and the number of retirements granted, were as follows:—

—	Captains.	Second Captains.	Lieutenants.
Number applied to retire - -	16	13	14
Number retired - - -	13	11	13

It must not, however, be forgotten that the offer was specially made to relieve the stagnation of promotion in the lower ranks, and it does not, of course, follow that there would be an equal readiness to accept the retirements if offered annually.

37.—That any officer in the rank of captain who has served not less than 15 and not more than 20 years, be entitled to retire permanently from the regiment on the half-pay of his rank, on the same conditions as those proposed for captains of the Line in Recommendation 3.

38.—That a major, if retiring from the Army after completing 23 years' total service, be granted a pension of 250*l.* a year.

39.—That any major who shall have been promoted to that rank after the date of any warrant which may be issued for carrying these recommendations into effect, on completion of seven years' service as substantive major, and not less than 27 years' total service, if not promoted to the rank of substantive lieutenant-colonel, be required to accept one of the following alternatives:—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 300*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with a step of unattached promotion, with the half-pay of a lieutenant-colonel of Royal Artillery and the chance of employment other than regimental.

The half-pay of a lieutenant-colonel of Artillery is 212*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* a year.

40.—That lieutenant-colonels, if allowed to retire with less than 27 years' service, be granted the same terms as majors retiring voluntarily under Recommendation 38.

41.—That lieutenant-colonels, if allowed to retire within five years of the date of their promotion to that rank, but with not less than 27 years' total service, be granted the choice of the following alternatives:— **Lieutenant-colonels of Royal Artillery.**

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 300*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with half-pay, and the chance of employment other than regimental.

C.—On completing 30 years' total service, *retirement from the Army* with the full-pay retirement of their rank in addition to any good service pension of which they may be in enjoyment.

The retirement to carry with it the same rights relative to widow's pension as are now attached to full-pay retirement.

In the case of the retirements under alternatives A. or C. of officers holding the brevet rank of colonel, the honorary rank of major-general to be granted only from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service.

42.—That regimental lieutenant-colonels who may have been promoted to that rank after the date of any warrant which may be issued carrying these recommendations into effect, shall on completion of five years' service as substantive lieutenant-colonels with the regiment, or on the Staff, be required to accept one of the following alternatives:—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* with a pension of 450*l.*, in addition to any good service pension of which they may be in the enjoyment, and with the honorary rank of major-general, to be granted from the date on which it would have accrued to them had they remained in the service. This alternative to remain open for acceptance at any time before the officer's promotion to the rank of major-general.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* with half-pay, and the chance of employment either on the Staff or in any of the posts now assigned to regimental colonels of Artillery, and the right of succession to the establishment of general officers.

Regimental colonels of Royal Artillery.

43.—That so soon as the last officer, promoted to the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel before the date of any warrant which may be issued to carry these recommendations into effect, shall have been promoted to be regimental colonel, no further appointments be made to that rank; and that from that time the rank of regimental colonel—except as to the then existing holders thereof—be no longer maintained.

44.—That regimental colonels, promoted to that rank after the date of any warrant which may be issued carrying these recommendations into effect, be appointed for five years only, and, on completing five years' service in that rank be required to accept one of the following alternatives:—

A.—*Retirement from the Army* on a pension of 600*l.* a year, and a step of honorary rank, to be granted from the date on which it would have accrued to him had he remained in the service.

B.—*Retirement from the Regiment* on full pay with a right of succession to the establishment of general officers.

The retirement to carry with it the same rights relative to widows' pensions as are now attached to "full-pay retirement."

Should any officer retiring from the regiment under alternatives B. of Recommendations 39, 41, 42, or 44 subsequently qualify for promotion to be general officer, his right of succession will be to the establishment of the Royal Artillery only.

No change of regimental organisation involved by abolition of regimental colonelcies.

It will be observed that in these recommendations we have included a proposal that the rank of regimental colonel should eventually be done away with. This, though in form an alteration of existing organisation, is not so in our opinion in the sense in which we have hitherto considered any such alterations to be beyond our province; for we are led to believe that this rank of regimental colonel has been created and maintained rather as a means of providing promotion than for the purposes of regimental efficiency, or the discharge of military duties requiring officers of that rank.

In suggesting its abolition, therefore, after other means of procuring promotion shall have been substituted, we have not thought that the limits of our Commission have been exceeded. These remarks apply also to a similar suggestion which we have thought it right to make in respect of the Royal Engineers.

We propose that the appointments hitherto held by regimental colonels of Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers should, when these ranks have been abolished, be conferred on lieutenant-colonels of the same branches of the service who may have completed five years' service as lieutenant-colonels.

Appointments to commands of brigades in India.

We take this opportunity of calling attention to a point of practice in which it appears to us that some change will, for a time at least, be necessary.

We allude to appointments to the commands of such of the brigades in India as are given to British as distinguished from Indian officers.

The present practice is, we understand, to confer these commands on the senior British colonel serving in the Presidency in which the vacancy occurs, if properly qualified for the post, without regard to the arm of the service to which he may belong.

But the "five-year rule" will come into operation in the Cavalry and Infantry some years sooner than in the Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers, and during the interval the senior colonels serving in the Presidency will in all probability be officers of one of the Ordnance Corps.

Unless, therefore, some change of practice is made in the mode of selecting officers for these appointments, an undue proportion will fall to colonels of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers.

ROYAL ENGINEERS.

Introductory remarks.

We have throughout our Report avoided touching on any questions of organisation, and have confined ourselves to the consideration of the best means by which the necessary promotion may be obtained on the supposition that the existing proportions of officers in the several ranks remain unchanged.

The constitution of the Corps of Royal Engineers is, however, very different from that of any other branch of the service. In the sense in which we have used the words they may be said to have little or no Regimental Organisation; that is to say, there are, with few exceptions, no specific duties attached to the several ranks. So far as the duties performed by the officers are concerned, it is, for instance, comparatively unimportant how many hold rank as captains and how many as majors.

The proportions of the several ranks appear to have been fixed and changed from time to time, chiefly with a view to secure promotion within such periods, that the officers might not be in a worse position in this respect than those of Royal Artillery, and might, if necessary, be varied without any inconvenience.

This was actually done in 1872, when, for promotional purposes only, two captains were substituted for two lieutenants in each battalion.

It will be seen from a paper which has been prepared for us by the War Office Actuaries, printed in the Appendix, that, unless some change is made, there will shortly be in the Royal Engineers, as in the Royal Artillery, considerable stagnation of promotion. Appendix L. (Part 2).

Under these circumstances we think that the necessary promotion in the Corps of Royal Engineers will be best secured by the following :—

Recommendations with regard to Officers of Royal Engineers.

Establishment of Royal Engineers.

45.—That the officers of Royal Engineers from the rank of lieutenant-colonel downwards be divided among the several ranks in the following proportions :—

Lieutenant-colonels	110
Majors	143
Captains	198
Subalterns	361
	812

And that these proportions be as far as possible maintained in the event of any changes being hereafter made in the total numbers of the officers of the corps.

It has been calculated that, if the proportions of the several ranks are fixed as above, promotion will on an average be obtained in the Royal Engineers after the following periods :— Appendix S.

To captain after	11½ years' service.
To major after	19 „ „
To lieutenant-colonel after	25 „ „

The numbers at present in the several ranks of the Royal Engineers (including those on the Indian Lists) are :—

Lieutenant-colonels	104
Majors	154
Captains	186
Subalterns	368
	812

Lieutenant-colonels and colonels of Royal Engineers.

46.—That substantive colonels and lieutenant-colonels, promoted to those ranks after the date of any warrant which may be issued carrying these recommendations into effect, be appointed for five years only; and that so soon as the last officer, promoted to the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel before the date of any warrant which may be issued to carry these recommendations into effect, shall have been promoted to be regimental colonel, no further appointments be made to that rank; and that from that time the rank of regimental colonel—except as to the then existing holders thereof—be no longer maintained.

47.—That the proposal which we have made for the retirement, &c. of officers of Royal Artillery be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to officers of the same rank and position in the Royal Engineers.

General officers of Ordnance Corps.

As regards general officers we recommend that the principle which we have proposed for adoption in the Guards and Line should be applied also in the Ordnance corps, and that on reaching a certain fixed age, to be for the present 70, general officers be removed to a "retired" list, and the vacancies thus caused filled in the ordinary manner.

Our attention has been called to the fact that since the establishments of general officers were fixed for the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers in 1854, the proportions borne by their numbers to the officers of the corps have considerably altered, the increase in the number of officers not having been accompanied by a corresponding increase of the general officers' establishment. We recommend—

See Appendix T.

48.—That additions of nine and seven respectively be made to the establishment of general officers of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers by promoting the senior qualified colonels in each branch, and that a corresponding number of regimental colonelcies be reduced.

Indian Ordnance Corps, &c.

The conditions and rates of the retiring pensions of officers of the old Indian Ordnance Corps, and of the 12 Non-Purchase regiments who formerly belonged to the Indian Army differ so essentially from those obtaining in Your Majesty's British Army, that we have not thought it expedient to submit any specific recommendations in regard to them; but as it is essential that the flow of promotion in these corps should be such as to ensure efficiency, and at the same time to secure to the officer an equality, as far as may be, in this respect with those of other branches of the service, we submit that the question may with advantage receive the consideration of the Secretary of State for India.

PROMOTION.

Regimental seniority the basis of regimental promotion.

Having dealt with the methods proper for procuring Retirements, we now come to the subject of Promotion.

We have taken much evidence and received many valuable opinions on this branch of our inquiry.

And it is on this subject that we have more particularly discussed and considered the systems prevailing in the French and German Armies.

In the result we are satisfied that no system is likely to give satisfaction to the Army or to work well which does not adopt seniority in the regiment as the basis of Regimental Promotion.

In saying this we do not intend in the slightest degree to break in upon or qualify the absolute control over promotion which has always resided in the Crown, and which has been freed even from conventional restraint by the abolition of Purchase.

Since that event we consider that all vested rights, or rather quasi-rights, to succeed in promotion according to seniority have passed away, and that any particular vacancy is at the absolute disposal of the Crown. To break in upon this power of selection in the slightest degree would be to renounce the one great end for which Purchase was abolished, and forfeit the benefit while retaining the burthen of that great change.

It is therefore as a recommendation only for the general exercise of this authority, that we propose regimental seniority as the basis upon which promotion should proceed in the regiment.

Confidential reports.

We find a system now in existence which has been much developed since 1871, under which the lieutenant-colonel in each regiment makes what is called a confidential report at stated intervals upon the conduct, abilities, and military qualifications of the officers under him, and this report is submitted to the inspecting general for his approval and remarks, and forwarded to the Commander-in-Chief.

If on these reports, carefully preserved and collated, any particular officer is shown to be unfit for promotion, he is not promoted.

The working of this system and the number of officers unfavourably reported upon since April 1873, and the course taken with respect to each officer, whether by retirement or otherwise, will be found in detail in a memorandum furnished to us by the Military Secretary. Appendix U.

Such is the present system for ascertaining the character and qualifications of officers, and we think that these reports will do much to maintain efficiency and good conduct in the Army.

Practically, then, the present system, which we do not propose to alter, comes to this, that promotion is, as a rule, governed by seniority, tempered by rejection.

Difficulty of promotion by merit in time of peace.

We should have been glad if we could have seen our way to the construction of any regular system under which those who had most merit and capacity should take the lead in promotion. But we doubt if it is possible, at any rate in time of peace. Military qualifications make themselves known in military exploit or action, and we do not think that any amount of acquired knowledge, tested by any form of examination, is a guarantee for the possession of those numerous and varied qualities which go to form the character of military excellence.

Nor are we aware that there is any other method but that of experience by which the possession of those qualities can be surely known.

But, as a rule, this experience can only be gained in active service, and active service, except in time of war on a large scale, comes only within the reach of the few, and it would be most unjust to those who have not had the good fortune of taking part in it, to retard their promotion in favour of those who have.

In these remarks we are speaking only of a system or rule of promotion, it is to be observed, and not of the casual promotion of individual officers by brevet or otherwise, for distinguished services when rendered. On the contrary, we think that the power of the Commander-in-Chief to push forward a deserving officer is most valuable in every point of view.

In furtherance of this object we recommend—

Unattached promotions.

49.—That one unattached promotion to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, two to the rank of major, and 10 to the rank of captain be placed at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief annually for the purpose of pushing forward individual officers, whether serving with Regiments or on the Staff, who, on the reports of their commanding officers or otherwise, are made known to him as officers of special merit and promise, using these terms in their wide and general sense, and by no means confining them to the possession of mental acquirements.

And, further,—

50.—That the officers thus selected be brought on to full pay as vacancies may occur, but in no case be kept on half-pay for more than a year and that in no case more than the above limited number should be borne on the half-pay list at the same time.

We have also considered the question of appointments on the Staff.

Staff appointments.

They are at present conferred for a period of five years only, in which we propose making no alteration, but we think that as a rule it is desirable that those appointments should be as widely as may be distributed over the great body of officers, and consequently that, as a rule, an officer on completing his five years' term should not be nominated to a fresh Staff appointment,

but return to his regiment. Official experience gained during the five years must, however, obviously tend to increase efficiency as a Staff officer, and this consideration will often make it desirable to depart from any general rule on the subject.

Brevet promotions.

With regard to the subject of promotion by brevet, it has been stated to us as nearly the universal opinion of those whose evidence we have taken, that of late years promotion by brevet for distinguished service has been much too lavishly bestowed. At the same time it is at present almost the only way of rewarding zeal and efficiency on active service, with the exception of unattached promotion, the objections to which last are, that it encumbers the half-pay list, and often removes the deserving officer from active service and his regiment at the very moment when he is distinguishing himself in it.

We are not prepared, therefore, to recommend that the practice of brevet promotion for distinguished service should be discontinued, but rather that it should be much more sparingly applied, and under some well defined rules and conditions which should be uniformly adhered to, and should practically restrict the number so promoted. By way of supplement to it, we think the grant of some decoration, accompanied by a small pension in the nature of brevet pay, would probably be acceptable to the Army, and serve to mark Your Majesty's approbation.

We are also of opinion that when the Army shall have been brought to the standard rate of promotion which we have recommended, the practice of conferring brevet rank on the senior major and captain in the Service upon a vacancy occurring on the fixed establishment of general officers may well be dispensed with.

Before leaving the subject of Promotion we think some remarks should be made on what is called

SUPERSESSION.

Supersession.

The casual advancement of an officer in one regiment or one arm of the Service, more rapidly than another officer in some different regiment or arm of the service in the ordinary vicissitudes of regimental Promotion, constantly tends to the one superseding the other in Army rank. This has never been the subject of complaint demanding redress among the officers.

But if the same thing happen by reason of some general measure or system applied by the military authorities to one arm or branch of the Service, and not to the others, "Supersession" so caused has at times been accepted by the military authorities as a legitimate grievance and ground of complaint on the part of those who have suffered by it, and the officers have been further encouraged so to regard it by the language which has been held on the subject in Reports of more than one Royal Commission.

We may mention, for example, the grievance felt by the colonels of the British Army at their supersession by the colonels of the Indian Army owing to the reduction in the number of Indian officers which it was thought expedient to make. This grievance was acknowledged by the military authorities and by a Committee of the House of Commons a legitimate one. Again, the changes made in the organisation of the Artillery were followed by the grant of brevet rank to some senior captains in the Line, which lessened in some degree the supersession of those officers of that rank through the conversion of the first captains of Artillery into majors.

We think that the time has arrived now that a new system of Promotion in the British Army is about to be designed and set on foot, when some definite conclusions should be formed and stated as to the limits within which any complaint of supersession arising in the various branches of that Army should for the future be considered just and reasonable.

There is no difficulty in saying that the different arms of the Service should be treated with impartiality; that no boon or benefit should be accorded to the officers of one, which under similar circumstances is withheld from the others.

That each arm or branch of the Service should, as far as practicable, have an equal share of the honours, distinctions, emoluments, and other advantages of the Service, is also a proposition not likely to be denied.

Among these advantages is that of a reasonably rapid flow of Promotion. We have already recommended that the rate of promotion should be as far as possible the same for all branches of the Service, and we think that to maintain that equality should be an object kept constantly in view by the military authorities. Any needless divergence, by way of boon or otherwise, from this fair and equal treatment of all alike, may well give rise to complaint and be the reasonable ground for redress.

But at this point in our opinion the reasonable limit of such complaints should in future be considered to have been reached.

If the efficiency of any one portion of the entire Army shall at any time demand some specific change in its organisation or treatment whereby promotion might be rendered quicker than in the rest, and "Supersession," as it is called, should be the necessary consequence, no complaint ought, we think, to be raised, or, if raised, entertained by the military authorities.

If, for instance, at any moment it should be found necessary largely to augment and thereby accelerate Promotion in one arm of the Service, and not the others, we think this necessity must override all other considerations, and that Your Majesty's Secretary for War ought to be free to make such augmentations without complaint or discontent in any other portion of the Army.

So again of reductions—if they should become desirable in a financial point of view, or otherwise, it ought to be no objection or impediment to their being effected in any one branch of the Service, that Promotion would thereby for a time be rendered more rapid or less rapid in that branch than in the rest of the Army.

It is desirable that the authorities should in these and the like cases carry out their views in the manner which will least disturb or affect the existing equality of Promotion throughout the Army, but they ought not to be driven to the alternative of either abandoning the changes which for the sake of efficiency they consider necessary, or of contriving some special methods by which the rate of Promotion may be kept equal through the entire Army.

But further, it must be remembered that with every desire to maintain the rate of Promotion equal for all, so long as the different arms of the Service are differently organised, a difference in the rate of Promotion will from time to time be pretty sure to occur, and individual "supersession" be the inevitable result.

A claim, therefore, on the part of the officers to treat this as a wrong done to them, is nothing less than a claim on their part to have all branches of the Service similarly organised, whether military efficiency require it or not.

Our opinion is that the just claims of every officer are satisfied if the arm of the Service to which he belongs is treated impartially with the rest of the Army, and if he receives Promotion according to a rate of Promotion which is reasonable for his own corps, and is only less rapid than that of other corps, when a different organisation or some needful measure of military efficiency has rendered it so.

Any larger demands than these ought not, we think, to be acceded to, the attempt to satisfy them must be fraught with *ever recurrent* difficulty, must seriously impede necessary changes, and tie the hands of the authorities on occasions when the public welfare requires that they should be perfectly free.

We have desired thus to record our opinion on this subject, because we consider that since Purchase has been at great cost to the State abolished, and complete control, independent of vested or quasi-vested rights in individuals, has been obtained over Promotion in the Army; it would be most impolitic and unwise to sustain and acknowledge for the future any *quasi-vested rights to equality of Promotion* between the several branches of it, and that an impartial treatment of the officers, *subject to the needs of the Service*, is all that they ought to be encouraged to claim, or the State to concede.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

Having offered these recommendations, we add a few words which may serve to show more plainly what we have intended and designed to do, and more particularly what we have intended not to do.

Voluntary retirements to be given or withheld as promotion requires.

The above system, then, is intended as a flexible one, under which the actual rate of promotion can be controlled.

It is an inevitable result of the Regimental system, and of promotion taking place within the regiment, that the officers of any one regiment may from time to time go forward quicker than those of another, by reason of more frequent deaths, or other causes of vacancy.

This inequality may, to some extent, be rectified in the granting or withholding voluntary retirements in each individual case, according to the general state of promotion in the particular regiment.

By the exercise of a like discretion the general rate of promotion may be held in check on the one hand, or stimulated on the other, throughout the Army.

And, further, we may remark that a system of this kind, capable of expansion or contraction in the hands of those who are to administer it, will readily adapt itself to the changes, by way of augmentation of the higher ranks or otherwise, which the future development of military organisation may render necessary.

Compulsory retirements to be absolute.

But there is another aspect of the question besides that which is connected with satisfying the reasonable claims of the officers to go forward in promotion.

No system of promotion throughout the grades of the Army can, we think, be considered adequate which does not provide for the attainment of the rank of field officer, and afterwards the rank of general officer, at ages sufficiently young to be a guarantee for efficiency in those ranks.

To achieve this end we have proposed that ultimately—

1st. No officer should be appointed to a regimental majority after more than 20 years' service.

2nd. No officer should be appointed a regimental lieut.-colonel after more than 27 years' service.

While, therefore, we think a discretion may and ought to be exercised by the authorities as to the extent to which they will from time to time, and in one regiment or another, allow voluntary retirements under the conditions indicated above, we recommend that the above periods of 20 and 27 years' service for compulsory retirement from the regiment be consistently adhered to.

These periods are, it will be observed, maximum periods, and will give to the country a security that the higher posts in the Army shall not be attained except at a time of life when full physical as well as mental vigour may be expected.

We lay great stress on this point. We consider efficiency to be paramount over all other considerations and objects, and we have founded our conclusions in this matter on the valuable Military Opinions, which will be found in the Minutes of Evidence.

Promotion to be equalised as far as possible in all branches, and not less rapid than under Purchase System.

In determining what the general rate of promotion should be, these two separate objects have both to be kept in view.

The rate of promotion which existed under Purchase was, as we have already stated,—

Lieutenant after $2\frac{8}{12}$ years' service.
Captain after 9 years' total service.
Major after $18\frac{11}{12}$ years' total service.
Lieut.-Colonel after $23\frac{6}{12}$ years' total service.

The rates which were laid down in 1867 as the "standard periods" for the Artillery, and which have been since adopted, were as follows:

Major-General after 40 years' service.
Colonel after 34 years.
Lieut.-Colonel after 25 years.
Captain (present Major) after 18 years.
Second Captain (present Captain) after 12 years.

It will be here observed that the rate of promotion in the Artillery is not identical with that of the Line.

That for the Artillery is more rapid up to the rank of major, but less rapid from the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

This difference is chiefly due to the difference of organisation, and is perhaps unavoidable. But we strongly recommend that in working out the scheme of retirements which we have proposed it should be the constant care of the military authorities so to regulate promotion that it may proceed as nearly as practicable at an equal rate in both arms of the Service.

On this subject it only remains to state in obedience to Your Majesty's command, that in our opinion no rate of promotion which is less rapid than that which obtained under the Purchase System can be considered "adequate "to maintain the efficiency of the whole Army in all its combatant "branches."

Officers to have no vested rights in retirements proposed.

It is important, however, to state what we do not intend.

We do not intend to create any new vested rights: on the contrary, we think it ought to be distinctly made known to every officer that any scale of pensions upon retirement which may be adopted, is not intended as a scale of fixed sums, which an officer has a legal or even a moral right to claim or receive, but a scale of retirements purely optional on the part of the Crown, and to be offered or not to individual officers according to the current exigencies of the service.

In other words, we wish it to be understood that in our opinion no vested rights or moral claims, having the practical force of vested rights, should be created in respect of pensions or sums of money on retirement, inasmuch as their adjustment in point of amount to the needs of the service is a matter to be determined only by experience.

Her Majesty's absolute control over all officers to remain unimpaired.

And, lastly, we wish it to be as distinctly understood that in nothing that we have recommended do we intend to suggest that the complete and absolute control of Your Majesty over the officers in all and every branch of Your Majesty's service should be in any degree surrendered or impaired.

COST.

We close this portion of our Report with an estimate of the expenditure which our recommendations involve.

Voluntary retirement forms so prominent a part of our scheme that such an estimate from the necessity of the case can only represent probability. It is framed, however, on a liberal principle, as we intend it to exceed rather than to fall short of the real result.

Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line.

Normal cost for Guards and Line.

Our calculation of the normal cost of our proposals are worked in two ways; (1) on the supposition that all pensions are commuted for a sum of ready money, in other words, are capitalised; (2.) on the supposition that no pensions are commuted.

We cannot of course foretell the number of officers who, having an option, will prefer a sum of ready money to a pension, but it is clear that the result will lie between the two suppositions. We exclude from calculation widows' pensions and distinguished service pensions, because they are not affected by our proposals. We include the pay of honorary colonelcies, and of unattached general officers, and all non-effective charges of combatant officers.

We suppose in the first instance that the scheme operates so as to produce the quickest promotion possible, that is, that wherever voluntary retirements are open they are accepted to the largest extent, and at the earliest periods permitted; and we find that when the disturbing effect of the purchase officers has passed away, and when our scheme is in full operation, the cost will be in round numbers:—

With no pensions commuted	- -	870,000*l.* a year.
With all pensions commuted	- -	623,000*l.* a year.

Appendix V., s. 8.

We suppose next that promotion is obtained only at the slowest rate possible under the regulations proposed; that is to say, that no officer leaves the service until practically compelled to do so; and when our scheme is in full operation we find that the cost will be:—

With no pensions commuted	- -	1,318,000*l.* a year.
With all commuted	- - -	658,000*l.* a year.

Appendix V., s. 3.

Both these hypotheses are, however, extreme, and the truth will probably lie between the two; we have therefore had a further calculation made, showing the cost on the assumption that promotion is obtained as nearly as possible at a mean rate. It will be:—

Appendix V., ss. 6, 7.

With no pensions commuted - - -	868,000*l.*
With all pensions commuted - - -	639,000*l.*

As a matter of fact, a proportion, but a proportion only, of the officers will commute, and the actual result will probably show a mean cost of about 750,000*l.*

These figures have to be contrasted with the charge involved in the existing retirement regulations when they are in full operation, in other words when all purchase officers shall have retired,

We estimate that these regulations would then cost—

Appendix E., s. 11.

With no pensions commuted - - -	629,000*l.*
With all pensions commuted - - -	285,000*l.*

If the result were in this case to be the mean between these two sums, it would amount to 450,000*l.* a year, and the cost of our scheme would exceed, when in full work, the cost of the present system by about 300,000*l.* a year.

But fewer officers would commute or take lump sums under the existing regulations than under our scheme, and the normal cost of existing regulations would probably approximate to 629,000*l.*

The promotion however obtained in return for the expenditure will be very different under the two systems. Our scheme will produce a rate of promotion somewhat quicker, while the existing system would produce a rate much slower than that which obtained under purchase. Under the existing system, indeed, the rate would be so slow as to impair seriously the efficiency of the army.

It should further be borne in mind that the Report of the Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials recommended payment of certain sums to the officers of Infantry by way of compensation. Had that recommendation been adopted it would have entailed a heavy additional charge.

Before quitting this part of the subject we offer an explanation as to the difference of normal cost when pensions are commuted and when they are not commuted. In the former case, each year bears only the burthen of its own pensions, inasmuch as the liability for those pensions is wiped off, once and for all, by the payment of a capital sum of money. In the latter case, each year after the system has come into full operation bears not only its own pensions, but an accumulated burthen of those of former years. In the former case the charge of the first year will be the same as that of, say, the twentieth; in the latter the charge of the first year will be very small, while that of the twentieth will be very large.

We have thought it desirable to state each case on the supposition of commutation, because it is only on this basis, which reduces every grant to its present value, that fair comparisons can be obtained of the cost of schemes coming into operation at different distances of time, working under different conditions, and attaining a maximum of cost under those conditions at different periods.

Immediate cost for Guards and Line.

The foregoing calculations have reference only to the future, for our scheme will not come into complete operation so long as any officers remain in the rank which they held before purchase was abolished.

We have, therefore, had a further calculation made of the cost which will probably be incurred in the first years of the intervening period.

We assume that the special retirements proposed for purchase officers are accepted in such numbers that, at the end of five years, promotion, now very considerably in arrear, will have been brought up to the rate which prevailed on the average in the Infantry during the last 30 years of the purchase system.

This calculation covers all the changes which we recommend for the Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line.

It includes the cost of Honorary Colonelcies, the unattached pay of General Officers, and the pay of officers already on the Retired List.

It does not include widows' pensions or distinguished service pensions.

The total sum covers all payments made for these services from Army Votes and from the Army Purchase Vote. It includes also the sum which will ultimately be repaid by India.

On the introduction of our scheme we estimate the cost—

For the first five years at - - 1,384,000*l.* a year.
For the following three years at - - 674,000*l.* a year.

	£
In the estimates of the current year the vote for the abolition of purchase contains provision for - - - -	460,000
Ordinary Army votes on account of the non-effective charges described above for combatant officers, contain provision also for - - - - - - -	460,000
Making a total sum of - - - - -	£920,000

In the second sum of 460,000*l.* no allowances are commuted.

As we have shown above, the heaviest charges consequent upon our proposals will be those incurred during the first few years; because, firstly, promotion is now in arrear, and special means must be adopted to quicken it, and secondly because the majority of the officers retiring during those years will be purchase officers.

We have assumed in our calculations that this extra expenditure will extend over a period of five years; but as the retirements will be chiefly voluntary it is of course impossible to say with certainty whether they will be taken to the extent which would produce this result.

Should the number of applications in any one year be larger than that which we have assumed, it will be within the power of Your Majesty's Secretary of State to withhold retirements for a time should it appear that the expense incurred would be immoderate.

As regards the

Ordnance Corps.

We have had two calculations made.

Normal cost for Ordnance Corps.

The first of these shows what will be the ultimate cost and effect of our proposals, as compared with those to be expected under the existing warrants and regulations.

The result is as follows:—

Under our proposals the ultimate normal annual cost, assuming the Indian Lists to have been entirely absorbed in the British List, will be for non-effectives—

With no pensions commuted - - 478,000*l.* a year. Appendix V.
With all commuted - - - 250,000*l.* a year.

But against these sums may be set a saving of about 52,000*l.* a year, which will result from re-arrangements which we have proposed in the effective List.

Under the existing rules the charges for the same items would be—

With no pensions commuted - - 333,000*l.* a year. Appendix E.
With all commuted - - - 191,000*l.* a year.

It will be seen, however, that, as is the case in the other branches of the service, the promotion obtained under the two schemes is very different.

Immediate cost for Ordnance Corps.

But our scheme will not immediately reach its full operation, and the British and Indian amalgamation will for many years be incomplete. We have therefore had a second calculation prepared, showing what will be the probable average annual cost incurred during the next nine years.

Appendix X.

The result is as follows:—

The probable charge on the Estimates for the British List will be during the next nine years 139,000*l.* a year, against 122,000*l.* a year, which is now, and would probably remain, payable under the present system.

Normal cost for all branches.

To sum up. The probable cost of our scheme when in full operation, after making allowance for the saving in the effective List of the Ordnance Corps, will be for—

ALL BRANCHES OF THE SERVICE,

With no pensions commuted - - 1,294,000*l.* a year.
With all commuted - - - 837,000*l.* a year.

Under the existing rules the charges for the same items would be—

With no pensions commuted - - 962,000*l.* a year.
With all commuted - - - 476,000*l.* a year.

The actual result must lie between the two figures, and the ultimate additional cost of our scheme as compared with that involved in existing regulations will probably be about 350,000*l.* a year, of which, on principles now in force, about one-third would be repayable by India.

In return for this expenditure the normal rate of promotion obtainable under existing regulations will be accelerated in the case of:—

Appendix V.

——	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.	Royal Artillery.	Royal Engineers.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
Captains - by	8	9	10	$8\frac{3}{4}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Majors - „	$15\frac{1}{4}$	$15\frac{3}{4}$	17	$15\frac{1}{4}$	4	$3\frac{1}{2}$
Lieutenant-Colonels „	$13\frac{3}{4}$	$13\frac{1}{4}$	$11\frac{1}{2}$	$10\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$	6
Major-Generals „	19	$18\frac{3}{4}$	$15\frac{3}{4}$	$15\frac{3}{4}$	4	4

Immediate cost for all branches.

We pass to the *immediate* cost of our scheme.

We estimate, on the assumptions already described, that during the first five years that follow its introduction, provision must be made on the average for 1,500,000*l.* a year, and during the next three years for 800,000*l.**

Provision is made in the estimates of the current year for a sum a little in excess of 1,000,000*l.*

It is difficult to state with exactness how much will in future be repayable yearly by India; but after allowing for the vote for the abolition of purchase, no portion of which is charged to Indian Revenues, we estimate her contribution during the next five years at an average sum of probably 200,000*l.* a year.†

Our calculations are all based on the assumptions that our proposals are at once carried out as they stand; that, excepting where we have made special recommendations to the contrary, existing cadres are maintained; and that the rule limiting the tenure of office of substantive majors and lieutenant-colonels to seven and five years respectively is rigidly enforced.

Should these conditions be altered, a corresponding alteration of the figures will of course follow.

---

* It will be observed that on our hypothesis the average charge for retirements in the sixth, seventh, and eighth years will be considerably less than it is in the current year. This is mainly due to the decrease which will by then have taken place in the vote for the abolition of purchase.

† The average sums repaid by India on account of these charges during the four years for which the accounts are complete has amounted to about 140,000*l.* a year.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Introductory remarks.

We are further commanded to report to Your Majesty our opinion as to the way in which "the relations of the officers of the British Forces to "officers of the Indian Staff Corps may be so adjusted as to do justice "to each."

See Appendix Y.

This question we understand to have reference to what is called the "Amalgamated List" of colonels, a list which is composed indifferently of colonels in the British Army and colonels of the Indian Staff Corps, arranged according to the seniority of each individual, calculating that seniority from the date when he attained that rank.

From this list the vacancies in a fixed establishment of general officers, common to both branches of the service, are filled up as they occur, taking the senior qualified colonel in the list to whichever branch he belongs.

This is the present system. The way in which it has arisen, and the causes which led to this arrangement (which has only been in force since February 1866) will be found detailed in a paper prepared by our directions by our secretary.

Appendix Z.

It must have been the intention of this arrangement, as it was just to the respective services, that the proportion of generals to the officers in each branch of the service, as thus fixed, should on the whole, be fairly maintained.

The difficulty, however, which was likely to arise from this arrangement was as follows:

If either of the two branches of the service should be so organised that the number of officers in it who become brevet colonels yearly is greater in proportion to its entire numbers than that of the other service, it will absorb more of the vacancies in the establishment of general officers which is common to both than its due share.

By the Royal Warrant dated 27th December 1870, the establishment of general Officers for the Guards and Line is fixed at the number of 275.

By the same Warrant it is provided that this number of general officers should be added to from time to time until the number of general officers so added should stand in the proportion of 1 to every 28 of the combatant officers of the Indian Staff Corps. This addition would represent a number varying from 90 to 100.

Now what has already occurred, and is about to occur, is this.

Since the system came into operation the British brevet colonels have succeeded to all the vacancies up to the present time on the establishment of general officers common to the two services and have occupied more vacancies on that establishment than the above-mentioned number of 275. But at a date not very distant, which is pretty surely calculated as 1879 A.D., the stream will begin to set the other way, and the Indian Staff Corps will begin and continue to fill all the vacancies for some time, and so continuously will an advantage accrue to them by reason of their organisation that they will inevitably occupy on the establishment of general officers a number of vacancies wholly disproportioned to the number of their combatant officers as contrasted with those of the British Army.

It might be thought that this alternative of advantage, first to one branch and then to the other of the service, is an evil which would cure itself in the long run, backwardness at one time being compensated by advance at another.

Unfair succession to establishment of general officers, a consequence of different system of promotion to rank of colonel.

But this is not so. The real reason of the preponderance of the Indian Staff Corps is that its *system of promotion is different*, and that it inevitably tends to produce more brevet colonels in each year, in proportion to its numbers, than the British Army.

If either upon our recommendation, or upon any other method that may be adopted, the proportionate number of colonels in the British forces could be guaranteed to be the same in the main as that in the Indian Staff Corps, the evil would in the long run disappear, and all that would remain would be the temporary preponderance to be met by some temporary measure.

But we think this result could only be attained with anything like security if the system of promotion were actually alike for both branches of the service.

This state of things must give rise to a complaint on the part of the British officers which we think is a thoroughly just and reasonable one.

The grade of general officer with its position and emoluments is the fair and expected reward for long service to which officers are entitled to look forward in each branch of the Army, and the number of appointments to it cannot for any one branch of the Army be curtailed without injuring the prospects of each officer in that branch.

Until the "Amalgamated List" above mentioned was devised, the practice seems to have been that each branch or arm of the service should have a definite number of general officers' appointments allotted to it, and we are of opinion that where there is any difference in organisation tending to a different rate of promotion justice to the officers in each branch can be secured in no other way.

We therefore submit to Your Majesty the following—

Recommendations with regard to the Indian Staff Corps and the General Officers' List.

We therefore recommend—

General officers of Indian Staff Corps and British Army to be separated.

51.—That the General Officers' List be divided between the Indian Staff Corps and British officers in the manner detailed in the following Recommendations, and that when such division has been carried out, officers succeed only to vacancies occurring on their own list.

52.—That the separation of the Lists take place at the time that the senior colonel of the Staff Corps on the Amalgamated List would have obtained his promotion had the Lists not been separated.

According to a calculation made by the War Office Actuaries in 1873 (see Appendix Z.) this would be, under existing arrangements, in 1879.

Should, however, the proposal of the Commission for the formation of "Retired Lists" of general officers be adopted, promotion from the rank of colonel will be quickened, and the point fixed for the separation of the lists will be reached proportionately earlier.

53.—That in the meantime the number of British generals be gradually reduced to the established number of 275, and that all vacancies in the Indian Establishment of generals which would have fallen to colonels on the British List, as well as all vacancies occurring among Staff Corps generals, be kept unfilled.

54.—That at the date fixed for the separation of the Lists, as many Staff Corps colonels be promoted as may be sufficient to complete the entire number of the future fixed establishment of general officers for the Staff Corps.

55.—That the names of all officers of the Staff Corps should continue, as at present, in accordance with the Royal Warrant of the 21st December 1871, to be borne in italics on the Indian List for the purpose of regulating the promotion of the Indian colonels, but that all vacancies among the generals of the Indian List which would, under existing arrangements, have fallen to officers on the Amalgamated List be absorbed.

It will be necessary that the Staff Corps Establishment of generals be graded in the proper proportion of generals, lieutenant-generals, and major-generals. This should not be carried out at once, but effected gradually in the following manner.

A Staff Corps lieutenant-general should be promoted to general when the lieutenant-general immediately above him on the imperial list shall obtain that rank, the same course being pursued in the case of the promotion of major-generals to the rank of lieutenant-general, until the proper proportion of each rank is attained:

If these recommendations should be adopted, each officer in each branch of the service will have his fair chances of succession to the General Officers' Establishment, whatever the rate of promotion may be which prevails either temporarily or permanently in any other corps.

We propose that the principle which we have recommended for adoption with regard to General Officers of the Guards and Line and Ordnance Corps should be adopted for the Staff Corps also, and that generals on reaching the age fixed should be removed to a Retired List and replaced by the promotion of a colonel.

(Signed) PENZANCE.
HAMPTON.
E. P. BOUVERIE.
E. B. JOHNSON.
ARTHUR HERBERT.
R. E. WELBY.
CHARLES FOSTER.

T. DIGBY PIGOTT,
Secretary.

5th August 1876.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES.

Name, Rank, and Office.	Date of Examination.	Principal Subjects of Evidence.	Page in Minutes of Evidence.	Page in Digest of Evidence.
ADYE, Brigadier-General Sir JOHN MILLER, K.C.B., Royal Artillery, Director of Artillery and Stores.	3rd May -	Artillery. Promotion; brevet rank; general officers; retirement; organization; staff.	118	15
AIREY, General Sir RICHARD, G.C.B., Adjutant-General to the Forces.	13th April -	Promotion; confidential reports; brevet-rank; retirement; staff; re-organization.	36	4
AMHERST, Lieutenant the Hon. JEFFERY C., Rifle Brigade.	11th May -	Retirement; brevets; cramming -	148	18
ARMSTRONG, Major-General J. W., C.B., Deputy Adjutant-General of the Forces.	19th April -	Promotion; brevet-rank; "five-years' rule"; retirement; general officers; organization.	75	10
BORTON, Captain CHARLES, 14th Foot.	11th May -	Promotion; brevets; retirement -	145	17
BROWNE, Colonel JAMES FRANKFORT MANNERS, C.B., R.E., Deputy Adjutant-General, Royal Engineers.	5th July -	Royal Engineers. Promotion and retirement.	181	19
BULLER, Brevet-Major REDVERS, 60th Rifles, Deputy Assistant Adjutant-General at Head Quarters.	6th May -	Staff College; brevet-promotion -	135	16
CAMBRIDGE, Field Marshal H.R.H. the Duke of, K.G., &c., Officer Commanding-in-Chief.	9th April - 23rd July -	First appointments; promotion; brevet-rank; age of officers; "five-years' rule"; retirement; general officers; staff; re-organization.	21 191	3 20
CLARKE, Captain F.C.H., Royal Artillery, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General at Head Quarters.	6th May -	Staff College - - -	133	16
CONOLLY, Colonel JAMES, Military Attaché at Paris.	19th April -	The French army - - -	66	8
COOKE, Captain WILLIAM S., 22nd Foot, Deputy-Assistant Quartermaster-General at Head Quarters.	6th May -	Staff College; military education -	130	16
DEMPSTER, Captain THOMAS CARROLL, 24th Foot.	11th May -	Promotion; brevets; organization -	146	17
ELLICE, Lieutenant-General Sir CHARLES HENRY, K.C.B., Quartermaster-General to the Forces.	13th April -	Promotion; retirement; re-organization.	44	5
GOODENOUGH, Lieutenant-Colonel WILLIAM H., Royal Artillery, Military Attaché at Vienna.	22nd April -	The Austrian army - -	81	10
GOUGH, Lieutenant the Hon. GEORGE, 14th Hussars.	11th May -	Retirement; entries; Staff College	148	18
HODGSON, Lieutentaut-General STUDHOLME J.	29th April -	Promotion; general officers; retirement; organization.	114	14

Name, Rank, and Office.	Date of Examination.	Principal Subjects of Evidence.	Page in Minutes of Evidence.	Page in Digest of Evidence.
HORSFORD, Major-General Sir ALFRED H., G.C.B., Military Secretary.	13th April -	Promotion ; brevet-rank ; confidential reports ; "five-years' rule" ; retirement.	48	6
HUDSON, Major JAMES, 84th Foot -	11th May -	Promotion ; brevet-rank ; retirement ; double-companies.	143	17
MACLEAN, Lieutenant-Colonel H. J., Rifle Brigade.	11th May -	Five-years' rule ; retirement; promotion ; brevet-rank ; organization.	139	17
PEARS, Major-General Sir THOMAS, K.C.B., Military Secretary, India Office.	14th June -	Indian Staff Corps ; General Officers	157	18
RADCLIFFE, Colonel ROBERT PARKER, Deputy Adjutant-General, Royal Artillery.	5th July -	Royal Artillery. Promotion and retirement.	171	19
SANDHURST, General the Right Honble. Lord, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Commanding the Forces in Ireland.	29th April -	Promotion ; general officers ; army education ; re-organization.	100	13
SIMMONS, Lieutenant-General Sir J. LINTORN, K.C.B., Royal Engineers, Governor of the Royal Military Academy.	22nd April -	Competitive examinations ; promotion ; general officers ; retirement ; re-organization.	88	11
STRATHNAIRN, General the Right Hon. Lord, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.	13th May -	Promotion ; age ; retirement ; five-years' rule ; re-organization.	149	18
SWINBURNE, Lieutenant PAUL, 80th Foot.	11th May -	Promotion ; retirement ; brevet-rank.	147	17
WALKER, Major-General C.P.B., C.B., Military Attaché at Berlin.	16th April -	The Prussian army - -	52	6

DIGEST OF EVIDENCE.

CAMBRIDGE, Field Marshal His Royal Highness the Duke of, K.G. (Commanding-in-Chief).

(*First Examination.*)

First Appointments.—Under competition, thinks much the same class of men has come in as before; though perhaps some desirable men have been excluded, 104; but it is too early to form an opinion, 105. Considers the system most objectionable; the only good system of entrance is a qualifying examination, with the qualification put as high or as low as you like, 106, 108, 109, 221. Competition gives the commission merely to the highest intellectual acquirement, 107, 112, without reference to physique, 110; whereas mental and physical conditions might be combined, 111. Candidates would have to be arranged in the order in which they qualified, 222-224. Would avoid the present re-examinations, 223–226.

The System of Promotion.—So far as the rights or interests of individual officers are concerned, promotion is by regulation a pure matter of selection, 1, at the will of the Commander-in-Chief, 2; but, in practice, promotion under witness has been regimental, subject to the rejection of a senior officer whom it may be undesirable to promote, 3, 4, 8, 198. This is the best system we can adopt at present, and a fair system, 5, 69. Since the abolition of purchase, the power of rejecting for promotion is a great instrument for keeping officers up to the mark, 70; as inefficiency or want of zeal would certainly exclude from promotion, 71. Should certainly pass over an officer who failed to pass his examination for a superior appointment; though would first allow him a little margin, 246. The examinations are modified from time to time; but, speaking generally, considers them sufficient, 247. Is opposed to carrying selection beyond the rejection of officers unfit for promotion, 29–32, 79. Promotion by selection for merit would involve striking a balance between the merits of 6,000 officers and would be perfectly impossible, 33–35. Active service discloses merit; but other officers, who have not the opportunity of shewing it, may have equal merit, 36, 37. This argument would not exclude promotion by selection in a case of very conspicuous merit 38, 199; when it is very advantageous, 201. Selection for promotion on a general list would be impracticable by means of knowledge of an officer in his own regiment; for how could the selected of different regiments be compared, 61. To pass one officer over others in a regiment would destroy the regiment: in cases where selectional promotion is desirable, would promote into another regiment, 62. [This will not apply to "rejection," 71.] Promotion to unattached rank does not effect the object, because the difficulty of bringing the promoted officers back to active service, 63, makes the promotion rather a loss than a gain to them, 64. To bring them back absorbs promotion and causes discontent in a regiment, 65, 67. Seniority promotion would be most popular with the great bulk of officers, 46. In the general run, officers are much on a par, 68.

The Regimental System.—Regards the keeping officers in the same regiment throughout their service as of great importance, 66. Promotion should be by seniority in the regiment and not seniority in the army, 6, 39, 40, which would destroy the regimental system, 7; that is, up to and including lieutenant-colonel, 41–43, 78. The inequality of promotion as between regiment and regiment is not an important evil, and is well understood by the officers, 44, 45.

Service for Promotion.—Would deprecate any positive rule requiring a fixed amount of service before promotion; but the authorities can and do exercise a discretion in bringing in officers from other regiments for promotion instead of promoting very young officers, 48–52, especially in the cavalry, 207. Would, however, only do this to alternate vacancies, 208. Objects strongly to the proposal to give some officers special seniority in virtue of passing the Staff College, &c., and other employment, as they need not be the best officers, 54; literary merit forming only one qualification which should not have undue preponderance over really military acquirements, 55. Would not increase the minimum service required for promotion beyond the present standard, 80.

CAMBRIDGE, DUKE OF—*continued.*

"Rejection."—On his turn coming for promotion, an officer reported against would be informed that he would be passed over unless the unfavourable report could be cancelled, 21, 72. If passed over by a junior in his own regiment, an officer should be made to retire, 22–23. 251–254; as he might, in action, as senior of his rank, succeed to the very position for which he is deemed unfit, 26, 27. To pass a man over is thus to destroy his career, and is a very delicate process, 28.

Confidential Reports.—Special confidential reports on every regimental officer are received annually to guide the Commander-in-Chief in making promotions, 9, 200, and are regularly posted up year by year in each officer's record, 202. They are endorsed by the inspecting officer, 10; but in considering reported demerit great caution is necessary, as different commanding officers have such different standards, 11; and witness would require extraneous proof, 12. These reports, being new, have undergone modification, and probably will require more, 13, 74. Witness considers it essential that a commanding officer's unfavourable report should at the time be explained to the inspecting officer in presence of the officer reported on, though the commanding officer and inspecting officer object to this, 13, 14, 20, 203, 204, 206; and he fears it is not done so generally as he wishes, 15–17. Such a system may tend to create bad feeling between officers, but ought to be imperative, 18, 19, 205. These confidential reports are a great advantage, 73; but it is necessary that the inspecting general shall so look into each report as to counteract individual prejudices before it reaches the highest authority, 75–77. The confidential reports have hitherto led to some, but not many, rejections, 47.

Brevet rank.—Brevet rank is a very economical mode of rewarding service in the field, 248; but there may have been too much of it. It is sometimes difficult to curtail it, 89, 90, 215, 216. It should be limited to distinguished personal service, 217–219. Annuities as rewards would in some respects take the place of brevets, and might be advantageous to some officers but would not bring distinguished officers, as brevet rank does, into a position enabling the State to employ them in high commands without injuring other officers in the matter of substantive rank, 91–93, 220, 249. Most officers would prefer the promotion, 250. Unattached promotion has not the same effect, because of the difficulty of bringing the promoted officer back to full-pay, 94–96. There is great disadvantage at times in a regimental officer holding higher rank by brevet than his regimental senior; but the balance of advantage is in favour of brevet rank, 97–100. Sees no alternative, 98, as there is no other reward to give except the Order of the Bath, 101; but any mixed system of brevet and increased pay would be well worth trying, 102, 103. A decoration, something like the Legion of Honour, carrying with it a pecuniary reward, might be appreciated instead of brevet; but the more common the decoration became, the less it would be valued. The Bath is valued so highly, because it is so rarely given, 257, 258.

Age of Officers.—Younger commanding officers are wanted; the younger age of those in cavalry regiments is an advantage; but men differ, and some are extremely active late in life, 113; would therefore be against a hard and fast limit of age, 114. A man should have a regiment by from 35 to forty, 115, 116; and there is a rule that a commanding officer should retire at sixty, 117. An officer who is not a major after 30 years' service ought to go, 118; but it would be hard to retire him at an early period, 119. Retirement ought to be made worth a man's while, 120. To fix a limit of service for promotion, but to allow the officers to serve on beyond it unpromoted, involves the point of seniority and succession to command in case of a casual vacancy, 121. Other openings for such officers should be given. The Control

CAMBRIDGE, DUKE OF—*continued.*

Department (except, perhaps, accountants, 123), and paymasters should be taken entirely from army officers, carefully tested, 122, 124; especially lieutenants, 227; which would be a gain to the State and to the officers, 122, 228.

The "Five Years' Rule" and Retirement.—Thinks the "five years'" rule should remain for lieutenant-colonels; but that re-appointment should be frequent [whenever a man has shown efficiency, 229]. The rule could not be applied to majors without crowding the half-pay list with them, 125–127. Does not object to the "five years'" rule as a retirement; but does object, if it is intended to again employ the officers affected by it, 128; the worst thing which can happen to a man is to be placed on the half-pay list, 129, 230, 233. Would only apply the rule to majors of very long service, and then as a retirement, 133. The Treasury would object to a great addition of Majors to the half-pay list, 130; and if they had to be brought back, the promotion caused by the rule would be lost, 132. The "five years' rule" rigidly applied to both lieutenant-colonels and majors, and supplemented by an adequate voluntary retirement to each grade, carrying a step of honorary rank, might be a great means towards securing proper promotion, and would tend to relieve the General Officers' List, 134–137, 233, 234. Objects to the "five years' rule," rather that it would flood the half-pay list than that officers would be lost by permanent retirement. The best would stay, and some must be lost if there is to be promotion, 138. Does not anticipate retirement in the ranks of captain and subaltern; promotion will stagnate as it formerly did in the seniority corps, 139, 140; is in favour of carrying down to lieutenants of 10 years' service a system of voluntary retirement, and would appoint such officers to the Surveyor-General's Department, 141–145. For retirement, would give full pay, including all allowances, except in the higher grades, where more would have to be paid, 146, 147, 235, 236. The artillery and engineer colonels will not take 600*l.* a year to retire, 147, 150; but they have the command of artillery brigades and districts to look forward to by staying, 148; and, meantime, are not worse off than on 600*l.* a year, 149; therefore, the retirement is not good enough, 237. Neither corps has a retirement offered to it after less than 25 years' service, 151. It ought to begin earlier; the whole army is becoming too old, 152. Under purchase there was earlier retirement, and to some extent still is, but that will die out soon, 154. Would prefer any optional to a compulsory retirement; but if the compulsory retirement be essential for promotion must accept it; only the pension ought to be exceptionally good, 255, 256.

General Officers.—Thinks the present system of becoming general officer is satisfactory, 155, 156. To separate the general officers into an active and a retired list would be very desirable; but it might be difficult to arrange, 157, 158. Dislikes a limit of age; but physical unfitness, or five years as a major-general without employment, might be a ground for removal to the retired list. Colonelcies of regiments ought to be open to both lists, 159, 160, 174, 191. Concludes that when one general officer was put on the retired list another would be made on the active list, 161, 162, 190; which would be virtually an addition (by retirement) to the number of general officers for the sake of creating promotion, 163–166. The major-generals would be younger, 169; and would have been a less period on half pay, which is very desirable, 170. Sees no objection to the system of rewarding merit by honorary colonelcies, which the army likes, 171–173, 239, 240; prefers it to a graduated scale of pay, 241. Would not except from promotion to major-general any officer who had qualified as colonel, 176–178. Unless the retired list were supplemental to the present establishment sees no benefit from it, 179, 180. It would be fair to the individual and a benefit to the state, 181. Any system of retirement must lead to increased expense; and this system would be as useful and valuable as any which could be devised, 182–186. There should be a fixed limit to the number, for financial reasons, 186; according to the rapidity of promotion which may be desired, 187; but the system could not be very rigid, 188, 189.

The Staff and the Staff College.—For junior grades on the Staff, appoints in their turn officers who have passed the Staff College, unless there be anything against them; for the higher grades makes his own selection, in conjunction with his Staff, and on his own responsibility, 81. At present, all junior staff appointments are given to officers who have passed the Staff

CAMBRIDGE, DUKE OF—*continued.*

College, except in case of proved merit in the field; any other course would cause much jealousy to those who had passed, 59, 60. For the staff, would prefer to select officers direct from regiments, 209. Would trust to regimental intuition to pick out the best officer, 56, by consulting the commanding officer, 57; but is sorry that system is not now adopted, 58. Would open the staff to officers who have not been to the Staff College. Is not opposed to that college, but would not extend it; and doubts if we always get the best men from it, 214. Would object to extend the Staff College into a professional school for the whole army; the regiment is the best school, 209, 212; except for very special studies, 213; and cannot be too much made the officer's home, 210. Approves, on the other hand, of the Naval College, because of the non-continuity of a naval officer's service, 210, 212. Considers that the five years' limit to staff appointments should be maintained, especially during peace; but that the authorities should exercise a large discretion in re-appointing very capable men, 82–87; and in case of active service should always take the best men, irrespective of their former staff service, 88.

Reorganization.—Notwithstanding that the artillery and engineers have twice the proportion of field officers which the line has, 259, objects to any measure of reorganization which would increase the number of field officers; there are too many already, 192. Any increase would add to the expense and diminish the efficiency of the army, by reducing the number of officers available for duties which should devolve on subalterns and captains. This is very much felt in the Indian Army, 193. Would not have more field officers even for war, 194. The Prussians have a larger unit; but nothing like so many field officers. Does not object to our captains being mounted, provided they remain captains, 195. Would not enlarge our unit; would have 1,000 in a battalion, 100 in a company. An English captain finds more than 100 men a most unwieldy command, 196. The cavalry squadron failed as a unit from the difficulties attending detachment duty, 242-245.

Number of Officers.—We have not officers enough, 197. There ought to be three officers to a troop or company, and in India four, 260; at home, one captain and two subalterns, 261; and every one appointed to the staff should be supernumerary, 263. The number of young non-commissioned officers to be expected renders this the more necessary, 260.

(*For Second Examination, see page* 20.)

AIREY, General Sir RICHARD, G.C.B., Adjutant-General to the Forces.

Competition for Entrance.—Competitive entrance examination does not secure the best officers, 432, 433. Desirable young men are excluded by the scholastic test; and the learning which gets a man in is usually crammed, and at once forgotten, 434–437. Nevertheless, would require a test examination, 438.

System of Promotion.—Is in favour of promotion for all ranks of officers by seniority, tempered by selection, 265, 270, 287, 330, in regiments, 266. Regards as an advantage the inequalities of promotion between regiment and regiment, 267–269. For a captain, would promote a subaltern who had nothing definite against him; but for a major or lieutenant-colonel would require positive proof that the officer was fit for the higher rank, 331–335. In the case of a senior officer being unfit for promotion, the promotion goes strictly by selection from another regiment, and not to the next man in the same regiment, 466–471. It would not be practicable to promote a man in his own regiment over the heads of his seniors, 314–316, 483; but the Commander-in-Chief can put him elsewhere, 484. Supersession is not necessarily rejection; an officer's service may be too short for promotion without injustice to others, 283, 284. To be rejected once as disqualified [or more than once, 505] should involve retirement, 286, in the case of a subaltern, 335; twice, in that of a captain, 335, 336. Is against fixing a minimum service before a captain can be eligible for promotion to field-officer, 288, 289; but would have a maximum, after which he should be ineligible for promotion and should be retired, 290, 291. The reports of the superior officers are the only way of learning the special merits of a young officer worthy of more rapid promotion than the average, 303. Such promotions are constantly made from one regiment into another, 305, for distinguished service, 306; which is preferable to giving unattached promotion, on account of the extreme difficulty of bringing back an officer from half to full pay,

AIREY, General Sir RICHARD—*continued.*

306–310. Would not fix a proportion of vacancies, as to be filled by selectional promotion; it is better to leave it to the Commander-in-Chief's discretion, 311–313. The only way to maintain equality of promotion to the rank of major between the artillery and the line is by occasional recourse to the special creation of majors, 450–456. In Prussia, the king gives any officer any rank he likes, 357; and passing certain examinations gives rank; but such a system would not be applicable in this country, 358. Is against efficiency being tested by a scholastic examination, 359; it proves only intellectual acquirements, 360, than which other characteristics are more valuable on service, 361.

Confidential Reports.—The system of confidential reports on officers is carried out very critically; thinks it is an efficient system, 271, giving quite reliable information, 273. The reports come principally under the cognizance of the military secretary, 272. Officers passed over should know the reason, 274, 275. Agrees that a commanding officer should at the time of reporting adversely on an officer let him know it, 276. It is not the positive rule now; but would make it so, 277–279. Thinks this would stimulate an officer to more attention to his duties, 280, 281. The reports will certainly afford a sufficient method of bringing forward capable men to commands, 283. They are annual and universal, 472, by the inspecting general, 473; based on what the commanding officer tells him and his own observation, 474; for which he has great personal opportunities, being identical with the general officer next in command above the lieutenant-colonel of the regiment, 475–481. These reports are not new; but, under Purchase, were rather a matter of routine. A new feature has been introduced from the French;—requiring information as to the officer's general characteristics, 482. An adverse report ought to be substantiated by oral evidence before being acted on, 285.

Age.—Age is a false criterion of efficiency, 362; though, as a general rule, there is an age at which a man becomes unfit to command a regiment, 363. No man ought to get the rank of major who was fifty, 364; but he should be a field officer at forty, 365, and to get the command of a regiment at forty-five, 366, holding it till 50 under the "five-years' rule," 367.

Brevet-rank.—Brevet-rank has of late years been too lavishly bestowed, 338, 348, 487. The fact that a junior regimental officer may, in virtue of brevet-rank, supersede his own commanding officer, which sometimes happens, is against harmonious working in the regiment, and a very great evil indeed, 339–344. It is the only means of rewarding an officer for distinguished service; but is not practised in any other European army, 345, 357; would rather see the distinguished officer granted substantive promotion, 346, 347. This is not the system now; though it could be done, 348, 349. Would substitute for brevet-rank an honour-list, officers appointed to which should have some decoration and a money reward, with the understanding that they were eligible for higher rank and higher employment, 349–353, 489. Is opposed to the system of brevet, 352, 486–488; but, if it be continued, does not see the way to restrict it, 354, as it is almost a reflection on an officer who has been on service to be excluded, 355. The date of brevet-rank fixes an officer's army rank for ever, 458, 459.

Five Years' Rule.—The "five years' rule" is good as a power of removing an unfit officer, but not to be exercised as a rule, 368, 490, and it would create a flow of promotion; but does not think it would be beneficial for the service, 370, 371, 491–497.

General Officers.—The general officers might be moderately increased, provided there were an active and a retired list, 393; removal to the latter depending on age and non-employment, 394–396; but not preventing succession to an honorary colonelcy, 400. Prefers honorary colonelcies to any modification he has heard of, 401; to a more even distribution of the money over the entire body, 402. Would do away with the half-pay general officers, but they are now dying out, 396–399.

Retirement.—To cause promotion would have compulsory retirement on full pay after a certain number of years' service, 403, 404; and a voluntary retirement at a reduced amount from the lower ranks would be very desirable, 405–407. Officers would probably go for a smaller sum than they sold for under Purchase, 409–412. If voluntary retirement be made too good, the best men are apt to leave the service for other pursuits, 299–301; and if not large enough, it will not effect its object, 302. Would retire a captain at, say, 20 years' service, 292. He must have a fair retirement, 293; larger than if it were voluntary, 294. It ought to be his full pay and allowances, 295; say 271*l.* a year, 297, 298. It would give a younger body of field officers than we have hitherto had, 299. Lieutenant-colonels completing their time under the "five years' rule" must go on half-pay, or be given other employment, 372, 388; which is very hard upon the officer, 373–376. The brigade-depôts and staff appointments could only provide for a limited number, 377, 378, 390; and the large number unemployed get rusty before becoming major-generals, 379, 391. The only remedy is compulsory retirement at a defined age, 380, 392; with a liberal provision, 381; that is, full pay and allowances, with a step of honorary rank, 382, 383. A general officer might be retired if unemployed for five or seven years, 384, 386, 387.

Staff College.—Would not increase the facilities for attending the Staff College. Changes might be made in the system of entrance. The Commander-in-Chief has power to make them. Officers often go there for motives other than a desire to study their profession, 413–416, 498, 500–503. To be allowed to go there is a favour; but it has come to be granted as a matter of course, 417. However, there are always plenty of candidates; and entrance is only obtained by competitive examination, 418–420. The majority of officers benefit considerably; but some come out, qualified scholastically, who are reported otherwise unfit for the staff, 422, 423. Would prefer to nominate for the Staff College young officers specifically reported by their commanding officers as likely to make good staff officers, 424–426, 430, 431, 504. The college holds about 40 officers, limited to captains and subalterns, 427, 428.

The Staff.—The staff is filled entirely by selection, 304, 317; the lower grades from men who have passed the Staff College, 318; the higher grades without that restriction, 319. In ordinary times the five years' limit to staff appointments should be adhered to; re-appointments being made at the Commander-in-Chief's discretion, but only in special instances. The knowledge of staff duties would thus be more widely distributed among officers, to the advantage of the service, 320–329. In time of emergency, the men of most experience would naturally be recurred to, 325. A field-officer can be put on the staff without passing the college, 427–429. An officer may present himself to be examined for the staff without attending the Staff College, 498.

Number of Officers.—There ought to be three officers to every troop or company, 460, 461. Officers are now insufficient for real service, 507, 515, particularly in India and the colonies, 508. Every officer employed away from regimental duty ought to be seconded, 509–515.

Reorganization.—In all foreign cavalry, the squadron is the unit, 462, 463. Is opposed to the double-company organization, 439, 460, and an increase of majors. It would give promotion to the junior ranks of course, but there would still be the difficulty of getting rid of the mass of majors, 439, 441. There are duties now done by captains which it would be *infra dig.* for field officers to perform, 442–446; though brevet field officers now perform them, 447, 448, 457, which is oneof the objections to brevet, 449. Only knows of double-companies in the Prussian army, 464. The French have the company and small battalions, 465.

ELLICE, Lieutenant-General Sir CHARLES HENRY, K.C.B., Quartermaster-General to the Forces.

First appointments.—Much the same class of men enter the army now as formerly, 585, 586.

System of Promotion.—In peace, promotion ought to go by regimental seniority (right up to lieutenant-colonel, 542); selection being limited to the rejection of palpably unfit men, or of officers who have served too short a time to justify promotion, 517. The regiment is a sufficient unit for promotion, 638. Sees no evil in any occasional inequality of promotion as between regiments, but does not expect much in the absence of purchase, 523-526; though there may have been 20 deaths in one regiment and none in another since the Crimean War, 636, 637. Selection for special promotion could only be made for efficiency in the field, 539; and then the officer should be promoted out of his own regiment, 540, 541. Under Purchase, by being allowed to buy unattached rank, an officer might exchange back into his regiment over the heads of his seniors, 632–634. The officers selected for unattached promotion seldom got on full pay again, 635.

ELLICE, Lieut.-Gen. Sir C. H.—*continued.*

Confidential Reports.—Would only use confidential reports as a ground for rejection, not selection, 518–522. They do not come under his cognizance, but believes they are to be relied on, 527, 528.

Age.—A field officer should be young, 529; but age is too poor a criterion of efficiency to allow of a limit, 530. An officer ought to become commander of a regiment after 30 years' service, 531.

Brevet-rank.—Brevet promotion is desirable as a means of bringing forward young officers, 543–545; does not think it interferes with regimental efficiency, 547; but it has been too freely bestowed, 548, 549, 615, and ought to be limited to cases of special distinction, 550–554; knows of no alternative system, 616.

"Five-years' rule."—Would retain the "five years' rule," but not act upon it, so long as an officer should be efficient, 555–558, 560–562, 617–619; a good voluntary retirement in the upper ranks would give promotion enough, 557, 559, 560, 563, 579, 580, 620, 621; a lieutenant-colonel left on half pay gets rusty, 564.

General Officers.—Would not object to increase the establishment of general officers, 565; would have a voluntary retired list open to general officers of 40 years' service, who should obtain a rather higher pay, but forego their chance of an honorary colonelcy, 596–600; would not accompany this retirement by a step of rank, 601.

Retirement.—For a retirement, the same should be offered to all arms. The scale in the engineers and artillery of 600*l.* after 40 years' service is not successful, 566, 567; the pay and allowances of the lieutenant-colonel of a regiment equal about 600*l.* a year, 568, 569; to give promotion, a captain might be compulsorily retired at 25 years' service, if not promoted, on a good retirement, 532–536, equal to his pay and allowances, 537, 538; is opposed to giving a lump sum to officers in the lower ranks as an inducement to retire; the best men would be lost, 570, 571, 578; it does not compare with the Purchase system, where the man who sold merely got back his own money, 572–575. Many were men of money, 576, who would go now without any inducement, 577; compulsory retirement should only be resorted to when absolutely necessary, and should then be a considerable retirement, 581–583; it would be feasible to give civil posts or positions in the Control Department or paymasterships to officers as a means of procuring retirement, 590; for every five promotions in the control, &c., would give one to the line, 592, as a commencement, 593; formerly paymasters were always so appointed, 594; now, the Secretary of State appoints them under the advice of the accountant general, 595.

The Staff.—Approves of the five years' limit for staff employment being adhered to, except in very special cases, so as to diffuse staff appointments over the army. After his five years on the staff a man ought to return to regimental duty; if a field officer, to half pay until there should be an opportunity of bringing him back, 586–589, 628, 630, 631.

Reorganization and Number of Officers.—It might be desirable to equalize the field officers i the different arms, 602. Would not object to increase the majors in the line, provided the captains and subalterns were not diminished, 603–607. Prefers the present company system; but, if necessary, for the sake of more majors, must resort to double companies and squadrons, 609–614. An officer on the staff should be seconded in his regiment, 623, 624. There should be three officers to a company in England and four in India, 626.

HORSFORD, Lieutenant-General Sir ALFRED H., G.C.B., Military Secretary.

First appointments.—Believes there is no social difference between the young officers first appointed under Purchase and those entering now by competition, 699–701.

System of Promotion.—As a general rule an officer would be promoted in his regimental turn if he have been reported fit for promotion, 644, 645; but too short a service might exclude a man, 646, and then there is an opportunity for bringing in an officer from half pay or from another regiment, 647, 648, tending to equalize promotion in the several regiments, 649. Prefers regimental promotion to promotion in the army at large, 650–652.

Confidential Reports.—Confidential reports are of two kinds. One of a general nature on the regiment which goes to the Adjutant-General; the other special

HORSFORD, Maj.-Gen. Sir A. H.—*continued.*

to each officer, which comes to and is kept posted up under the orders of witness. The latter are annual, but have only been in force three or four years, 640. Doubts if the form can be improved, 641. Approves of the commanding officer being obliged to tell any officer that he has reported unfavourably of him, 642, 643.

Age.—Age is a bad criterion of efficiency, 676; but officers should, if possible, be young in all ranks, 677. A man ought to be fit to command a regiment at thirty, 678; but would exclude him from succeeding to one at fifty, 679, though it would be hard to shut out men at forty-five, 680.

Brevet rank.—Thinks brevet promotion has been too lavish of late, 654; it chokes the upper ranks, 656, 658, 659, 707; but sees no other way of rewarding distinguished service, 655, 659. Inconvenience in a regiment from brevet rank is rare, though it sometimes happens, 657. Nobody is promoted whom the general does not recommend, and not always all whom he does, 662; it would be difficult to restrict the recommendations, 663, 664. In lieu of brevet promotion, money rewards might be given, as an extension of the good service pensions, 708–711. A decoration is worth consideration, and would be unobjectionable, 712–716.

Unattached Promotion.—Unattached promotion tends to shelve a man, 665, for it stops promotion in a regiment to bring him back to full pay, 666, 667. The half-pay list should be kept as small as possible; but is a necessary system to have at hand, 666.

"Five Years' Rule."—The "five years' rule" ought to be retained for use if required; but it is a pity to remove an active and good officer, 668, unless his status be improved by the move, 722, though it would help promotion very largely, 669. It could only be worked by giving the removed lieutenant-colonel the option of accepting a good retirement. Hopes the rule may not be applied to majors, 670, as the half pay of major would be worse for a man than the full pay of captain, and there would be little prospect of further employment, 671, 673; and no retirement would compensate the major for being ousted from his profession, 674, 684. Does not know the average time a lieutenant-colonel held his command under purchase, 675. In the absence of the "five years' rule" the only way to obtain promotion is to make it worth while to retire, 682. Brigade-depôt commands must be made more tempting than they are now, 723.

General Officers.—An increase of the fixed establishment would relieve the lieutenant-colonels who are waiting on half-pay; but at additional expense, 694–696. Sees no objection to dividing the general officers into an active and a retired list, 689; it would allow of making more generals, 690; and would be the pleasantest way of applying money to procure promotion, 691.

Retirement.—A liberal voluntary retirement for lieutenant-colonels would get rid of the probable stagnation, 692, 693; and relieve the half-pay list of those waiting to become general officers, 697, 698. Retirement would be most useful in the upper ranks; but might be necessary in the others, 683. Many officers would accept a fair retirement, 685–687; and many would go without any inducement at all, 688. Thinks retirement might be offered to lieutenants after 10 or 12 years' service and captains after 20 years' service, but none at 15 years, 716, 717, 720. The men really fond of their profession would remain, 718, 719. If more than two prices were offered, there might be retirement after 15 years' service, 721.

Staff College.—Thinks the selection of officers for the Staff College should be more strict. Would like the commanding officers and major of the regiment to pick out the best man for the staff, 702–704; the Commander-in-Chief could not do it so well. For the staff, tact is often wanted more than talent, 705, 706.

Majors.—If the line is to go with the artillery, a large promotion for the former or a stoppage of it for the latter will be necessary, 724; regrets the extensive substantive promotion given to the artillery and engineers; but sees no remedy now, 725–727.

WALKER, Major-General C. P. B., C.B., Military Attaché at Berlin.

Has been 10 years military attaché at Berlin, 728, 729.

First appointments (Prussia).—Every officer must serve previously in the ranks, 1108, which he usually does for more than a year, 837, 838. Young men

intended for officers come in under a severe examination, 1028. They usually become officers at 17, 18, or 19, though the limit is twenty-two, 837. There is scarcely ever promotion from the ranks in the sense in which we should have it, 1112. There is a dearth of candidates for commissions, 1059, 1060.

Rank and Promotion (Prussia).—*Generally.*—Promotion is made solely by the Emperor himself and the Military Cabinet; the War Minister has nothing to do with it, 811, 1006. The system of promotion and retirement is uniform in the several arms, 732–736. Rapidity of promotion is secured by the number of retirements, on pension, of captains worn out by hard work, 875, 877; the work being harder during peace than in war, 876. There is no minimum service for promotion, 1091. Captains generally in time of peace get that rank after 11 to 12 years' service; majors, 18 to 22 years, 832, 833; lieutenant-colonels after 23 to 28 years' service, 834, 835; three or four more years to become colonel, 836. These periods have had the benefit, more or less, of the war acceleration, 1100. The war accelerated promotion enormously; before 1866 there were subalterns of 20 and even 22 years' service, 1096, 1097, but in the higher ranks the promotion was quicker, 1098. The block is in the lower ranks, 1099. Before the war there were too many old officers, 1110. The officers are very much of an average age, 840. Supersession is carefully avoided by keeping back one arm until another reaches its level, 775, 776, 908. Officers are often removed from one regiment to another to equalize promotion; taking rank in the regiment according to their army commissions, 790, 791, 1090.

Seniority, tempered by rejection.—There is very little selection in promotion, 742; not even for the command of the 18 army corps, 743–745. The whole system is rejection; officers passed over twice find it necessary to retire, 747, 756, 1087, in all ranks, except, perhaps, subaltern, 748. Seniority is broken in upon by rejecting all not thought fit, 750, but it holds, in the main, up to field officer, 755, and in the higher grades those only are promoted who are thoroughly capable of more responsible duties, 754. Inefficient officers are very freely and summarily ejected, 1086, 1089. Sometimes to be passed over once involves retirement, twice always, by a general understanding, 794. Promotion is made on the divisional reports on every officer sent to the Military Cabinet biennially by the lieutenant-general of the division through the corps commander, 812–814. Selection is not impossible; but is very rare, 916. Doubts if rejections greatly affect the lower ranks; but thinks they are much above two per cent. among regimental and divisional commanders, 815–817. The Prussian system is highly effective, 1004, and commands the confidence of its officers, 1005, notwithstanding the grievous disappointment of those who are rejected for promotion, 1006–1008.

Captain.—Promotion is regimental up to captain, with very few deviations, 763. A company is so responsible a command that its captain can scarcely fail to be fit for promotion to the command of a battalion, 757, 759.

Major.—To major, promotion runs through the army corps, 784, 792, with occasional promotion into another army corps, 788, 789. Most rejections are in the grade of major, 759; that is, the proportion on half pay from major is greater than from other ranks, 793, 797.

Lieutenant-Colonel.—The lieutenant-colonel is merely senior to the majors; either may command a battalion; and a lieutenant-colonel if very high up may command a regiment; there is no specific charge assumed on becoming lieutenant-colonel, 760, 761.

Colonel.—Promotion from a battalion to a regimental command goes by seniority throughout the entire arm in the whole army, 799–803; subject to a most large rejection, 804; but cannot say of what per-centage; should call two per cent. very large, 804–810.

Major-General.—Next above colonel, is major-general, 894. Promotion to major-general is accelerated by the general equality in seniority of colonels of all arms, 901. From the command of a regiment to that of a brigade the step goes by seniority throughout the army in the special arm, 818, 819, 907; with rejection largely and rigidly applied, 820, 821. There is no interval for a colonel between the command of a regiment and that of a brigade, 898–900, 1009.

Lieutenant-General and General.—To the command of a division and the command of a corps, promotion goes through the army, without reference to arm [artillery and engineers being in practice generally excluded, 828–830] 822, 823, 826; with the largest ratio of rejections. In these highest ranks, by means of various collateral appointments, officers rejected are let down easily, 824, 825; such as governors of fortified places, 1073.

Field Marshal.—The number of field marshals is not limited, but the rank carries no higher pay than that of general, 993–995.

Acceleration of Promotion by Staff Employment.—More rapid promotion is obtained by service on the staff, 841, 854; which often carries substantive promotion, by habit but not of right, 846–851, 854, 978. The officer usually returns to a regiment with higher rank than when he left, 981; without causing jealousy, 982. Promotion for staff employment must bear a very small proportion to the seniority promotions, 984–992.

Army or Brevet Rank.—There is very little army rank as distinguished from regimental rank, 768; but it does exist to a small extent, being given in cases of very slow regimental promotion, 769–773. Field service is rewarded by decorations, which confer neither rank nor pay, 1080, 1082. Their abundance depreciates them with sensible people, 1083, 1084. There is nothing corresponding to our brevet rank, 1081. Is doubtful which is the worse system, 1085.

Courts of Honour.—In every regiment, the "Court of Honour" [Ehrengericht], and the "Council of Honour" [Ehrenrath], both composed entirely of officers of the regiment, take cognizance of the general conduct of the officers, 948–951, 954, 958, and of all concerning their character as gentlemen, 952, 953; but in no way of their fitness of promotion, 1088. These courts are almost invariably attended to by the authorities; but only the king can act upon their reports, 955, 956. All the officers constitute the Court of Honour, and seven officers the Council of Honour, 957.

Artillery and Engineers—Officers of artillery and engineers hold an inferior social position as compared with other arms, 1076; coming from the non-noble class, 1077. They are dissatisfied with their position, 1078; but hold their own in point of education and professional acquirements, 1079.

General Officers (Prussia.) General officers are paid according to their rank and charge, 996–1,000, in a graduated scale, 1,001. There is nothing analogous to our honorary colonelcies; such appointments in Germany not carrying pay, 911–913, 998. The number of major-generals is not limited (except by the amount of pay voted, 902–906); but there are very few beyond those actually employed, 895–897. Retired general officers form a separate list from the 255 actively employed, 924–927; composed of those placed there for inefficiency, physical incapacity, or by their own desire after a full term of service, 928. The retirement is decided by the Emperor personally, 929–933. There is a separate retired list provided out of the French indemnity for officers worn out in the late war. Money for it is so funded as to last 44 years, 934. There are 387 Prussian general officers on ordinary pensions, 935; besides 62 on the indemnity fund, 937. The pension depends on the years of service, and the active grade quitted, 939. The Prussian system and ours are too different to admit of comparison, 1002. In no army are the officers so fitted for the positions they hold as in the Prussian, 1003.

Retirement (Prussia.)—The retirements are much in the same proportion as in our own army, 960. No compulsory retirement on account of age, 917, 918, 930. Retiring pensions are very liberal; one-eightieth of pay and allowances (held for a year before retirement, and subject to some small deductions) for each year of service, with certain eightieths added, up to a maximum of sixty-eightieths, 961–968, 1107. A captain of the first class reckons retirement on 251*l.* 10*s.* a year, 969, 970; and after 25 years' service can retire on 91*l.* 14*s.* a year, 971–974; a field officer commanding a battalion would get 204*l.* after 25 years' service, 975. There is a voluntary retirement under the Pension Act, 795; but officers, at the time of becoming majors, have hardly served long enough for it, 796. A pension may be had after 10 years, if health has broken down, 878; retirement cannot be claimed under 60 years of age without a certificate to that effect, 879, 919–921; but the certificate is only formal, and never refused after 25 years' service, 880, 959. Many men of rank and family serve for a few years only, but the bulk of officers make the army their life profession, 798, 1,102. Those who thus go, retire mostly as captains or subalterns, 1103. A large class of officers for private reasons obtain permission to retire without pension, with the condition of service first in the Reserve, and then in the Landwehr, 880–891, 959. Service in the Landwehr is unpaid, 1104, 1105. Civil

WALKER, Maj.-Gen. C. P. B.—*continued.*

employment is held out as an inducement for officers to retire, 1106.

Organisation (Prussia).—*Generally.*—The organization is the same during peace as in war, 1014. The units are, company of infantry, squadron of cavalry, battery of artillery, company of engineers, 762, 1048. Every company gets two-thirds of its number as recruits every year, 876.

An Army Corps thus comprises two divisions of infantry (25,000 men on a war footing), two brigades (three regiments each) of cavalry, 17 batteries of artillery, one battalion of engineers, and one battalion of train, 786, 787.

The Cavalry squadron contains 137 men in peace, 150 in war, with as many horses; is divided into four divisions, 1049, 1051. They have nothing corresponding to our troop, 1050. The Prussian organization is the more effective, 1052, 1053. The squadron has a captain, first lieutenant, and three second-lieutenants, 1055, in theory; but in practice seldom more than two second-lieutenants, 1056–1058.

Infantry.—A regiment of infantry, under a colonel or lieutenant-colonel, has three battalions, each under a lieutenant-colonel or major. A battalion has four companies, each under a mounted captain, with one first lieutenant and (on paper) three second lieutenants, of whom not more than two are often present, 764, 765–767, 774, 775, 777. The battalion has one supernumerary field officer (generally the junior major, 780, 1064) whose duties are with clothing and the regimental funds, 766, 1067, and who is available to take command of a battalion in the absence of its commander, 778–780, 1067; he assists the commander of the regiment in the field, 781. He is very necessary, 1068. Two regiments make a brigade, two brigades a division, and two divisions an army corps (subject to some slight deviations), 785. A company is a quarter-battalion, 757, having 250 men, 758, in war or 130 in peace, 765; under a mounted captain, 757. The advantage of the double company is still a moot question even in Prussia; but change is not likely, 1045. It is doubted whether, with the present tremendous fire, one man (no longer able on account of the fire to sit on horseback) can control 250 men, 1046. If the five officers could always be kept to the full strength they might suffice for 250 men organised in one company, but then the captain has no account duties, 1070, 1071.

Artillery.—The proportion of superior officers in the artillery has of late been brought up to that in other arms, but an artillery or engineer officer in high command is infrequent, 741, 751, 827, 1074, 1075, not being thought suitable for it, 746.

Numbers of Officers.—Nearly 19,000 officers are actively employed, 868. Details the numbers in the several ranks, 924. The place of an officer appointed to the staff is at once filled up, 853. In the field there is a terrible deficiency of officers, 1069. Organization is the same in different arms, 737; but the infantry has the largest number of officers, 738. The proportion of field officers is virtually the same, 739. As compared with the British army, the organization gives less captains and more subalterns, 1061. There are five field officers to 12 captains, 1062–1065.

Paymasters.—Paymaster is a military officer really in the position of a civil officer, 1111. There is a paymaster for each battalion. The accounts are very simple; no stoppages, 1072.

Non-Commissioned Officers.—The want of non-commissioned officers is severely felt, 1031.

The Staff (Prussia).—For the staff physical attributes—strong physique, riding, temper, tact, judgment—are as much considered as mental acquirements, 940–947. The work on the staff is extremely hard, 982. Selections for the staff are almost exclusively made from officers who passed three years at the War Academy, then a year in the General Staff Office at Berlin, and have then been found efficient in subordinate staff appointments, 855. Selection for the staff by Count Moltke is absolutely just, 861, 862; the officers go backwards and forwards from staff to regimental duty, never remaining long on the staff without returning to a regiment, 842–845, 979, 980. There is no fixed term of staff service, 852; appointment to the staff entirely dissevers an officer's connexion with his regiment, 844. Generals (unless of reigning families) have only adjutants, not aides-de-camp, 864.

Tenure of Appointments (Prussia).—There is no limit to the tenure of any rank or appointment, 914, 915, 931, 1010. The command of a regiment may, on the average, be held from six to eight years, 1011, 1012.

WALKER, Maj.-Gen. C. P. B.—*continued.*

Military Education (Prussia).—*Generally.*—An officer cannot be too highly educated, 1041–1043. Only about 5 per cent. of the men who enter are without a fair education, 1034. There is no competitive examination in Prussia, 1037–1039.

The Inspector-General of Military Education superintends all military educational establishments, 1015, viz., the war-school, schools for non-commissioned officers, and board of examination of officers, 1016. He has assistants, but no council, 1017, and is the sole authority, 1018. The War Academy is not under him, 1020. Excepting the cadet-schools, these are the only educational establishments affecting officers, 1030. The others under the Director-General are the cadet-schools, and two orphan-schools for soldiers' sons, 1033.

Cadet Schools train young soldiers who, in consideration of the education they receive, agree to serve longer than the period for which all Germans are liable. The State hopes that these will qualify for non-commissioned officers, 1031. The plan seems to succeed, 1032.

Regimental Schools.—There is a sort of regimental school in every regiment, 1034.

War Schools.—The war schools are scatterered all over Prussia, and are those to which every young man must go after attaining the rank of *Fähnrich*, 1021, 1025, 1026 (the man with the silver sword-knot, 1022). The education is mainly professional, 1024, 1029, and the normal course ten months, 1027.

War Academy.—The Academy is under the chief of the general staff, 1020. It has a good effect on the proficiency of officers, 1040. The numbers at the War Academy are limited, 856, 1035. Qualification is four years as subaltern, a good character from his commanding officer, and passing a qualifying examination, 857, 1037. Candidates are selected according to the reports on them, 858, 859, 873, 1036; probably by the director-general of military education, 874; not in the least by favour, 860, 861, 982; though jobbery would be possible, 983; only subalterns can enter, 857, 867. About 300 are there at one time, 868. There is no competition, 1038. The course is very severe, and many subalterns feel not up to it, 869, 870; a very small per-centage enter, 1044. Many candidates are rejected, 872; students continue to belong to their regiments, and return to them for the autumn manœuvres, 871. An idle or non-progressing officer is returned to his regiment, 864, 866. Attendance involves very hard study; but the quarters in Berlin are very comfortable, 865. After passing, a student is attached to other arms for three months, 871. There is no promotion for passing through the Academy, 977. It is a mark of distinction to have passed the War Academy; adjutants are much selected from those who have certificates, 863.

CONOLLY, Colonel JAMES, Military Attaché at Paris.

Universal Military Service (France).—At present military service is compulsory on everybody, 1228, without substitutes, 1229, 1330, 1331, for five years with the colours and 15 in the reserve, 1247, 1248. All men of 20 either join the army, or, if not wanted, are drilled with and for the reserve, 1249, 1333, 1334, for six or 12 months, 1250. "One year volunteers" pay 1,500 francs and pass certain examinations to escape four out of their five years with the colours, but are nevertheless liable to serve during war, and do not avoid in any degree their reserve service, 1245–1248, 1253, 1254, 1332, 1408. Non-commissioned officers will not stay after their five years, which threatens a difficulty, 1405. The system of recruitment is a copy of that in Germany, 1377.

First Commissions (France).—Except those who enter through the military schools, all must go in as privates, 1230, 1231. An officer not from the ranks must come from a school, 1324–1326. One from the ranks does not undergo an examination, 1328, nor is there a limit as to age, 1358, except that a sous-lieutenant cannot enter until eighteen, 1232. The colonel of the regiment recommends men for commissions, 1316. The proportion from the ranks is arbitrary, 1349–1355. Many of those who rise from the ranks are those who have failed at St. Cyr, 1318–1320. The tendency is to discourage promotion from the ranks, 1382, as providing uneducated men of too great age, 1383.

System of Rank and Promotion (France).—*Social Distinctions.*—The officers from St. Cyr and those from the ranks form two distinct classes; which do not associate except on duty, 1175, 1176. One consequence is, there is no mess in a French regiment, 1177, 1178. The

CONOLLY, Colonel JAMES—*continued.*

officers from the ranks do not associate with the men, 1176. Gentlemen of family not intending to make the army their profession are a very small class in the French army, 1226, 1227.

Seniority and Selection.—The system of promotion is that of 1832, and is now transitional, 1115–1120, 1194, 1281–1283, with the probability of great changes, 1284–1287. The first appointments to *sous-lieutenant* are by selection; thence up to *chef de bataillon* by seniority, unless there is something very much against the man. For lieutenant-colonel and all higher grades, and for *gros major*, there is strict selection. In the field there is selection for everything, 1149–1154, 1199, 1200. The promotion up to captain is by regimental seniority, 1215, 1217; beyond, the seniority is by army rank, 1215. Even in the lower ranks there is selection, which means interest, favouritism, and jobbery. To a certain extent it is a great evil, 1180–1183. An officer would not usually be promoted over his seniors in his own regiment, 1216–1220. The general of division prepares, with the aid of the colonels of regiments, a *tableau d'avancement*, showing the services, &c. of the officers he recommends for promotion. Every spring the generals meet at Paris, and from their *tableaux d'avancement* the selectional promotions are made, 1155–1157. The system produces heartburning, 1158, 1163, and the seeking of interest, 1159. There is a *dossier* made up each year on every officer by his colonel, who gives it to the general, 1160, 1161, 1259. Cannot say whether the whole is shown to the officer reported on, 1162. An examination before promotion is contemplated, 1323.

Sous-Lieutenants.—All the sous-lieutenants take their turn together for promotion, 1180.

Lieutenants.—Has seen many grey-haired lieutenants, 1172, all of whom are from the ranks, 1173.

Captains.—Sous-lieutenants who enter from St. Cyr do not pass through the ranks, and become captains young enough; but officers who have risen from the ranks often have 30 years' service before becoming captains, 1168, 1174, 1179. There is much passing over in promotion to *chef de bataillon;* but does not wonder at it, for about two-thirds of the captains who have risen from the ranks are 50 years of age, and quite unfit for promotion or service, 1164–1167, 1313, 1314, 1356, 1407.

Chefs de bataillon.—The educated officers probably become *chefs de bataillon* after an average of 20 years' service, *chefs d'escadron* after 18 years, 1185, 1187, 1193. There are few *chefs de bataillon* from the ranks, except gentlemem who have enlisted, 1317–1320.

Colonels out of a regiment, but not retired, would be *en disponibilité*, 1206–1212.

Artillery and Engineers.—The system is the same for the artillery and engineers, but there is less selection, 1277, 1278. Promotion is as quick as in the line, 1386.

Brevet Rank.—There is nothing resembling brevet rank, 1205, 1213, 1221.

Honours.—The Legion of Honour and the *medaille militaire* are granted as rewards for service in the field, and are much valued, 1223–1225. They carry a small graduated annual payment, 1255–1262. The *medailles militaires* in limited numbers (according to the Budget, 1337, 1338) are given to the most deserving non-commissioned officers and privates, by selection, and to an officer who has had an independent command before an enemy, 1256–1262, 1335. It is highly prized, 1336.

Age of Officers (France.)—As a consequence of the inadequate retirements officers commanding regiments are very old, 1271; often sixty, 1272; the majority not reaching the rank until between 50 and 60, 1274. The age of the officers injures the army, 1359. Sixty-two is too old for regimental service, 1360. A sous-lieutenant cannot enter until eighteen, 1232.

General Officers (France).—There is an establishment of 100 generals of division, and 200 generals of brigade, 1201, 1307–1309. It has been increased with the increased number of appointments, 1202–1204. Marshals are done away with under the republic, 1202, 1312; and there are no generals, 1306, 1310.

Remuneration of Officers (France).—Lower ranks miserably paid, but after the rank of *chef d'escadron* the French army is better paid than ours, 1406, 1445; the allowances in the higher ranks being very liberal, 1442. A general of division can well live on his allowances, 1443. Maximum pay is as follows, in Paris (lower in the provinces), exclusive of allowances, 1418–1431:—

CONOLLY, Colonel JAMES—*continued.*

	Cavalry. £	Infantry. £
Colonel	393	369
Lieut.-colonel	309	288
Major	265	244
First captain	175	166
Second captain	163	154
First lieutenant	133	123
Second lieutenant	129	119
Sub-lieutenant	123	115

Each officer has a barrack allowance, 1432; with coals, candles, forage, servants, 1433; except in a fortress where furniture is provided, 1441. Officers get their theatres, tobacco, and railways much cheaper than other people, 1434. They pay no income tax, 1435. An officer commanding a cavalry regiment can drive troop horses in his carriage, 1444.

Tenure of Appointments (France).—There is no limit to the tenure of any office except the age of 62, 1379–1381.

Retirement (France).—At 62 every officer not a *général de division* must retire, generals of division at 65 (subject in the latter case to exceptions), 1188–1192, 1397–1399. There is no earlier compulsory retirement, 1263. Maximum retirement may be taken as 64*l.* a year for captain; 80*l.* for *chef de bataillon*; 96*l.* for lieut.-colonel; 120*l.* for colonel; 160*l.* for major-general; general of division, 240*l.*, exclusive of rates for Legion of Honour, 1409–1417. Officers think themselves badly paid, 1403; and the pensions illiberal, 1438. Few retire until compelled to do so, 1264–1266; the retirements not being attractive, 1267, 1401, 1436, 1440. After 25 years' service an officer would rarely be refused *retraite;* after 30 years he has a right to it, 1268–1270. Captains from the ranks go as soon as they can get their *retraite*, 1170, 1184; lately after 30 years' service, now reduced to 25 years, 1169, 1171. In retirement captains are called by their title, 1315. Many of the officers retiring seek appointments in the gendarmerie, or as station masters, 1393, 1394; or collectorships in the finance department, 1401; or in the *bureaux de tabac*, 1402. They hold on for the sake of obtaining these appointments, 1437. The War Office has nothing to do with officers *en retraite*, the Minister of Finance has, 1275. Pensions do not fall on the military budget, 1389. Never heard of commutation, 1276, 1404.

Military Schools (France).—*Admission.*—Entrance to the schools is by competitive examination, 1233–1236; the vacancies being far fewer than the applications, 1237.

St. Cyr is entered by competitive examination, 1327. The payment is within moderate means, 1361, 1362; and subject to exceptions, 1365. Dates from the time of the Revolution, 1363. It is only for officers of cavalry and infantry, 1384. Students are at St. Cyr between two and three years, 1240; and are sent away unceremoniously if idle, 1242, 1244. Those so sent away are obliged to enlist as privates, 1245. All who pass out get commissions, 1329. Many gentlemen are in the ranks who have failed for St. Cyr, 1238.

The *École Polytechnique* educates for the Ordnance corps, and also for the *ponts et chaussées*. Is not entirely like Woolwich, 1385.

Army Schools.—Schools for officers, non-commissioned officers, and men have been formed since the German war, 1321, 1322.

Organization (France).—*Generally.*—The peace organization admits of ready expansion for war, 1387, 1388.

Cavalry.—In cavalry the squadron is the unit, under a first captain, 1341, and four other officers, 1346. The regiment has six squadrons, 1343, of 163 men and 148 horses, during peace, 1344. Its field officers are colonel, lieutenant-colonel, three *chefs d'escadron*, and a *gros major*, 1347; each *chef d'escadron* commands two squadrons, 1348.

Infantry.—A regiment comprises four battalions, of four companies each, and two companies of depôt, 1121. There are in peace 82 men to a company, 328 to a battalion, and in a regiment 1,312 besides the depôt, 1122-1124. Each company has a captain and a first and second lieutenant, 1125. Each battalion is commanded by a *chef de bataillon* corresponding to our major, 1126–1128; over the four battalions are a colonel and lieutenant-colonel, 1129–1132, 1196. A regiment has two adjutants, the adjutant-major who is a captain, and a lieutenant as assistant, 1197. In the manœuvres no battalion exceeds 300 men, 1289; but could be soon

CONOLLY, Colonel JAMES—*continued.*

filled up from reserves and territorial army, 1290. On a war establishment the regiment of four battalions would be raised from 1,312 men to 3,000 rank and file, 1294, 1295; without altering the organization beyond adding one officer and five non-commissioned officers to each company, 1291, 1296–1302. Officers considered that there should be two captains to a company of 250 men, 1395, 1396.

Artillery.—An artillery field battery is commanded by a captain, 1279.

Brigades, Divisions, Corps.—Two regiments constitute a brigade under a general of brigade, with a variable staff, 1135–1139. The division, under a *général de division*, has two brigades of infantry, with cavalry and artillery, 1140–1143. The divisions are aggregated into 19 *corps d'armée*, one to each military division; but the constitution and strength of these varies greatly, 1144–1148.

The *gros major* is a staff officer, one for each regiment, at the head of the non-combatant duties, acting as paymaster and quartermaster; he has many assistants, 1132–1134, 1303, 1305. In war he remains with the depôt, 1304.

The Staff (France).—The staff is a separate corps, 1366, 1367; framed by selection, 1373; and a source of great dissatisfaction in the army, 1368; from which officers rise to colonel and *général-de-brigade*, 1369, 1378. Many consider that staff officers should do more regimental duty than heretofore, 1370–1372. There is no interchange between the staff and the army at large; but this will be changed, 1375.

ARMSTRONG, Major-General JAMES WELLS, C.B., Deputy Adjutant-General to the Forces.

First appointments.—The officers entering under competition differ little from their predecessors, 1548; but has no faith in it as a mode of entrance, 1549, 1550. Would require a liberal education, that of a public school, and make the entrance examination more professional, 1551–1553.

System of Promotion.—Promotion in all grades should be by regimental seniority, tempered by rejection of inefficient officers, 1459–1461, 1486, 1487, 1571. Inequalities in promotion as between regiments do not create dissatisfaction, 1462, 1463. In case of the senior officer in a regiment being unfit for promotion, would take the first qualified officer in the same regiment, rather than bring one in from another, 1471–1475, 1569, 1570; the individual passed over ought to retire, 1476. Would not give quicker promotion for passing Staff College, 1483, or foreign service, 1484.

Regimental System.—Approves of promotion by double battalions, but decidedly objects to it by linked battalions, 1597–1600. Would be sorry to interfere with a regimental system which has produced such officers as Kinglake describes at Inkerman, 1581–1583.

Confidential Reports.—Thinks the confidential reports afford sufficient information for regulating promotion, 1477, 1481. Has not heard that they cause dissatisfaction in regiments, 1478. An adverse report should be made known to the officer reported on, 1479, 1480.

Age.—An officer should not be promoted to major (unless for immediate retirement) after 30 years' service, 1464–1466; nor to lieutenant-colonel after 60 years of age, 1467, 1468. From 35 to 40 is the best age to accede to a command, 1469, as it requires physical activity, 1470.

Brevet Rank is not entirely satisfactory, and does at times produce awkwardness in regiments, but it brings forward young officers who have distinguished themselves; does not see how it could be done without, having existed so long, 1490–1495; but a reward for distinguished service or a good-service pension might be used instead, 1625. Brevet rank has been given too profusely; should be limited to specially distinguished conduct. 1627–1629, 1641–1643. If all majors of artillery in action had brevet promotion a large similar measure would be required for line majors, 1644–1646. We have decorations enough, 1626.

"Five-Years' Rule."—Disapproves the "five-years' rule," except as a means of removing an unsatisfactory officer, 1520–1524, 1572–1578, 1607. The great inducement of going to half pay to get the "over-regulation" no longer exists, 1526–1530. Admits that the lieutenant-colonel remaining in command blocks promotion, 1531, 1532, 1619. A lieutenant-colonel should not be left too

ARMSTRONG, Major-General J. W.—*continued.*

long in command of a regiment, 1617, 1647, as he loses energy, 1618. Without the "five-years' rule" the major succeeding might be almost too old for a command, 1620. There are many staff and depôt appointments eligible for lieutenant-colonels who have served efficiently with regiments, 1603; enough to retain efficient men, 1621, 1622, which would meet the approval of all interested, 1623.

Retirement.—Is not aware of any appointments which could be offered to induce officers to retire, 1611, except in the case of subalterns, who might go to the Control or other civil offices, 1614, 1615. Beyond this it would merely be a money inducement, 1613. Keeping an officer on half pay, except from ill-health, is undesirable and inconvenient, 1536. It is undesirable for lieutenant-colonels to be long on half pay before becoming general officers, 1512, 1513. It would be an improvement if they could avoid it altogether, 1648. A liberal retirement might prevent it, 1514; say, 25*s.* a day, 1516, with honorary rank as major-general, 1517. Would not make this retirement compulsory, 1518, 1519, 1607. Would offer a retirement to the majors after the five years expired rather than put them on half pay, 1533–1535. A liberal retirement might be offered to captains, say full pay and allowances after from 20 to 25 years service, 1537–1542. Sees no objection to a retirement being offered to lieutenants, 1542–1547, 1607.

General Officers.—Would divide general officers into an active and a retired list, 1496–1499. Would put on the retired list those general officers who had never commanded a regiment, or been substantive lieutenant-colonels, or held relative staff positions, 1500, 1504, 1580; next those incapacitated by age, 1505–1507. Honorary colonelcies should only fall to those on the retired list who had distinguished themselves, 1508. Would keep up the number of the active list, 1509, without limiting the retired list, 1568, making thus additional general officers, 1510, as a mode of creating promotion, 1511, 1515, 1607.

The staff and Staff College.—Approves of the Staff College, 1561; but thinks the best regimental officers do not, as a rule, go there, 1562–1566. Would not increase the college, 1567. While commanding a regiment would not have had any difficulty in selecting an officer qualified for the staff, 1584–1590. Would approve of commanding officers selecting officers to go through the Staff College; but would require the college course before appointing them to the staff, 1591–1595. Does not think that under the existing system an unfit officer would be allowed to compete, 1596. Staff appointments should be disseminated as far as possible in the army, 1488, 1489, 1606; but would not object to the advancement of an officer from one staff grade to a higher, 1579, 1664.

Organization.—Every company or troop should have three officers, 1557, 1559, 1560, with more in India, 1558. The advantage of double companies is an open question, 1638–1640. Supersession between artillery and line seems inevitable, 1554. The proportion of field officers ought to prevent supersession; to be equalized in the artillery and the line; but would do this by reducing the artillery, 1630–1634. Does not say this with reference to efficiency of the artillery, 1632; and as compared in importance to an infantry company under a captain, there is a consistency in having a major over a horse artillery battery, 1635–1637.

Local rank in India.—The local rank in India is objectionable, 1601; and the staff corps ranks are incompatible with any scale of promotion likely to take place in the English army, 1602.

GOODENOUGH, Lieutenant-Colonel WILLIAM H., R.A., formerly Military Attaché at Vienna.

First Appointments (Austria).—Officers enter at from 17 to 25 years of age; practically at twenty, 1715. To obtain a first commission young men pass for and are appointed cadets, 1771. Some are raised in each regiment by the regimental schools; some come from the War Academy. The want of officers is great. The cadets have to qualify to pass a severe examination for officers. 1772. Such cadets are the most numerous, 1773; but some of the aristocracy enter, 1774. Pains are taken not to admit an officer socially unfit, 1790; and the officers of the regiment can express their opinion on the point, 1821. Many of the officers are of very humble origin, 1698; and some are rough specimens, 1796; more officers being required than the

GOODENOUGH, Lieut.-Col.—*continued.*

aristocracy could ever supply, 1770. There is no direct promotion from the ranks, 1791, 1792, but a young man entering as a private has every opportunity of qualifying for a cadet, 1793, 1794. This privilege is largely made use of, 1795. Such aspirants are protected by the officer commanding, 1824. There has recently been difficulty in obtaining sufficient candidates to fill the vacancies. Consequently each candidate who can pass obtains a commission; but he must pass the qualifying test, 1729–1733.

Rank and Promotion (Austria). — *Qualification Returns.*—A qualification return for each officer is made yearly on which the question of his promotion rests, 1678, 1679. The qualifications are ascertained by a committee of officers in the regiment, of a rank above that of the officer reported on, 1680–1684. The report is minute on the officer's professional and social character, 1685, 1686, 1789. It is used for rejection, not selection, 1687, 1695. The qualification return passes through every superior for his *visa*, 1700, 1701. An officer may demand to see his qualification return; and if a disqualification is one which he can correct his commanding officer must give him a certified copy, 1696.

Seniority with Qualification.—Promotion up to lieutenant colonel goes, as a general rule, by seniority through each arm, coupled with qualification, 1675–1677, 1688, 1694; but there is also special promotion for officers who have passed certain higher examinations. Vacancies arise from death or retirement, 1743, but promotion is very slow and unsatisfactory. The captains are too old, 1744–6. Not aware of any restriction on the tenure of appointment as colonel, lieutenant-colonel, or major, 1702. Not many are passed over under the present seniority system, 1807. There is no favouritism as regard promotion. The transition from aristocratic patronage has been too sudden, 1755; 1756. The aristocracy are driven out of the army, 1757–1760. The aristocratic element tended to soften the rougher officers, 1797; but its absence is more marked than formerly, 1796. Very few officers of means enter to stay only a few years, 1822, 1823.

Examinations for Promotion.—Similar to our Staff College is the War School, 1737, at which attendance is voluntary, 1738. If a lieutenant pass out with a certificate marked "excellent" he is at once promoted to first-lieutenant, 1739, 1740. If his certificate be "very good" he obtains a right to promotion out of his turn; but the last privilege is now in abeyance, 1741. There is a qualifying examination for promotion to major 1734, 1736, none compulsory after that step, 1735, 1805; but there was a system under which majors and lieut.-colonels could expedite their promotion by passing a voluntary examination, 1742. The examination for major includes the handling of a mixed force, 1808, also strategy, 1809. Each officer is required to know one language of the monarchy other than German, 1814, 1815. At the annual manœuvres every superior officer is tested by his superiors in handling the three arms, 1808.

Captains.—Many captains prefer local appointments to promotion, 1813.

Majors.—The rank of major is reached in 20 or more years in infantry, 15 years in cavalry, 1709–1713, 1752–1754; after which he would be 10 or 15 years obtaining the command of a regiment, 1714, say at 49 years of age in infantry, 1716.

Colonel.—Promotion to colonel is according to a general seniority list, 1689-1692, 1699.

General Officers (Austria).—Major-generals are selected from the colonels; but ordinarily promotion falls to the seniors, 1717, 1718. The same applies to lieut.-generals, 1719. General officers have a salary according to rank, and command pay, 1728. There is a fixed list for active general officers, 1799, based on the posts to be filled, 1800, 1802, 1803. No fixed establishment in our sense, 1801. General officers too old for employment form a separate retired list, 1723–1727; which is formed from those on the active list who become inefficient by age or ill health, 1804. The proprietor [Inhaber] of a regiment has not now any administrative power: formerly the promotion in the regiment rested much with him, 1761–1765, 1768. The proprietor is analogous to our honorary colonel, 1766, 1767, and may be on the active or retired list of general officers, 1784. Proprietors are selected from the general officers as vacancies occur, 1785, 1786. To be "proprietor" does not carry increase of pay or any military advantage, 1787, 1788.

Age (Austria). — The command of an infantry regiment is reached about age forty-nine 1716.

GOODENOUGH, Lieut.-Col.—*continued.*

Retirement (Austria).—There is no compulsory tirement, 1703. After 40 years every officer is entitled to full pay retirement in all ranks, 1704, 1707. For earlier retirement physical disability is necessary, 1704–1706, the pension follows a regular scale dependent on service, 1706; beginning with one-third the full pay after 10 years' service, 1708. Efforts are being made to get retired full pay after 35 instead of 40 years' service, 1825, 1826. Retired officers are on two lists, those fit and unfit physically to serve, 1820. There is no definite rule as to an officer passed over retiring from the service; but in practice he frequently would, 1697, 1698, 1806. There is no half-pay except in the case of a few officers temporarily disqualified for service, 1720–1722.

Regimental System (Austria).—Men constantly move from one regiment to another; but there is strong regimental *esprit*, 1747–1750, though not the same family feeling as where men live and serve together through many years, 1751.

Organization (Austria): *Cavalry.* — The unit of cavalry is a squadron of 150 men (always at war strength), of which six make a regiment, 1777, 1778. Each squadron has a captain, two first-lieutenants, two lieutenants, and an officer's representative, 1779–1781. The major and lieutenant-colonel command each three squadrons, and the colonel the whole regiment, 1782. There is also a proprietor, 1783.

Infantry.—The infantry unit is the company. There are 80 regiments each of three service and two reserve battalions, 1654. Service begins at the age of 20 and lasts 12 years; three years with colours, seven with reserve, and two in Landwehr, 1655. Of non-commissioned officers and privates a company comprises 231 in war and 91 on a peace strength, 1657. A company has a captain, two subalterns, and a cadet, 1658, 1659. Since the year 1866 four companies make a battalion, 1660, 1816, which has a field officer and an adjutant, 1661. The battalion was made of four companies as a technical improvement after the experience gained in war, 1817. Over the three service battalions are a colonel, lieutenant-colonel, adjutant, and quartermaster, 1663–1665 irrespective of the "proprietor" [Inhaber], 1769. The lieutenant-colonel is second in command, 1666. An infantry captain is a mounted officer, 1810, but does not get forage, 1812. In war an extra subaltern is added to each company, 1841.

Brigades, Divisions, Corps.—Two regiments form a brigade, 1668, under a major-general, 1669, aided by a brigade staff officer, 1670–1671. Next comes the divisions, 1672, under a lieutenant field marshal (equivalent to our lieutenant-general), 1673. Above the division is the *corps d'armée*, only existing in time of war, 1674; in peace there are no *corps d'armée*, but there are territorial commands, to each of which there is an extra general officer, without duties. This admits of expansion for war, without involving many new appointments, 1827–1830.

Supernumeraries.— Officers on long leave or on sick leave are made supernumerary and their places are filled up, 1819.

The Staff (Austria).—After passing the War School an officer is usually appointed by selection to the brigade staff, 1831, 1836, 1837, 1840. Staff officers are supernumerary regimental officers, 1832, 1834, and must return to regimental duty for two or three years before promotion, 1833, 1835. The tenure of staff appointments is not otherwise limited. Staff duty does not give increased pay, 1838.

SIMMONS, Lieutenant-General Sir J. LINTORN, K.C.B., R.E., Governor of the Royal Military Academy.

First Appointments.—*Competition.*—Believes, from the experience of 15 or 20 years, that competition will not prevent that class of men from entering the army who have entered it hitherto. Under competition those who enter the artillery and engineers are equal socially and superior in education to those who entered previously, 1867, 1868, 1872. Before competition, men of the same social rank, but with less money, entered the artillery as compared with the line, 1873. Young men from public schools are a better class than from other sources, 2007. The high examinations have not excluded sons of men of property, who come in more than formerly, 2008. Low examinations might admit boys from parochial schools, 2009.

Cramming.—In competitive examinations, it is of the first importance to defeat cramming; an evil of which the existence is indisputable, 1869, 1870. During the

SIMMONS, Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. L.—*continued.*

last three years cramming has brought the wrong material to Woolwich, 1871. The medical examination does not always detect the evil results of cramming, 2030. Many lads entering Woolwich Academy are very much broken down by hard cramming. Hopes to defeat that, 2005. "English literature" is violently crammed, 2006. Proposes to require from all a minimum of mathematics and then that the examination shall principally rest upon a sound knowledge of mathematics, or of classics, 2007.

Woolwich Final Examination.—The examination is intellectual, and is decided upon marks; but proficiency in drill and athletics counts, though not for much, 1993, 1994. Superior intellectual power usually accompanies physical power, 1995; but in some cases the physique has been unable to sustain the mental strain; cites a case, 1996. In case of very bad conduct a cadet would be removed from the academy; he is under observation for two and a half years, 1997–2000; but there is no test for the moral qualities which make a good officer, 2001. Wonders that sufficient candidates are found for the artillery and engineers, considering the disadvantages both as to money and age they are under, as compared with other branches. Attributes this to those corps having a few good prizes, 1875–1877, 2001–2003. The senior cadets at present select the engineers, because though the emoluments are not so good as in the artillery when they first enter, there are superior advantages later, 1991, 1992. The artillery and engineers demand, on the average, 70 young officers annually, 1900.

Age of Officers.—Regards 18½ to 19 as the probable future age for entrance, 2202. Officers should be young enough to have proper physical power for their respective duties, 1893; and the age for retirement should have reference thereto as well as to the necessity of creating a flow of promotion, 1895–1897. A man should not command a regiment after fifty, 1894.

System of Promotion.—*Artillery and Engineers.*—In artillery and engineers officers are promoted by pure regimental seniority up to regimental colonel; afterwards, according to their army seniority, as colonels, 1989. Witness never was a regimental colonel, 1990.

Selection objected to.—Knows no system of selectional promotion which would ensure justice to individuals, 1860. An examination, though proving high intellectual power, is not sufficient indication of the best man for field duty, it only tests one out of many necessary qualities, 1861–1863.

Seniority, with Rejection, by Promotional Units.—Is in favour of promotion by seniority tempered by rejection of men not fit and competent, with selection for distinguished service in the field, 1842, 1843, 1856. For promotion would treat the artillery, cavalry, and engineers, each as one corps, and would divide the infantry into districts or corps. Then, up to major would promote by regimental seniority entirely in the case of officers actually serving in the field before an enemy, otherwise by regimental seniority provided it did not give an officer more than two years' advantage over any other officer in the same promotional body. If it did, would promote by seniority throughout that body. Would thus retain the regimental system within certain limits, 1844–1850. The majors should be promoted according to seniority in the promotional body, 1853, 1854; the lieutenant-colonel by seniority throughout the arm, 1855. Colonels should be promoted according to seniority throughout the army, 1855. Would group infantry regiments into districts for promotion, because the whole infantry would be too large a body, 2010–2012; and a single regiment too small a body, 2011. The infantry districts quoad promotion should not be the military districts in which regiments may happen to be serving, 2015.

Generally.—The rate of a flow of promotion must be judged by the average of several years, 1901, 1902; say five years, 1903, 1905. To obtain a fixed promotion every year would be an impossibility, 1904. A fair average flow of promotion would give general satisfaction, 1906; if brought about by forced retirements with liberal pensions or pensions at the naval scale, 1907–1908. There would be no insuperable difficulty in adopting his system of promotion to the present. It would be popular with the army, as increasing the promotion to major 2,004. There must be a period of transition, whatever system be adopted, 1886, 1889, 1910.

Confidential Reports.—An officer should be warned of an unfavourable confidential report upon him; but he should not be passed over without three consecutive unfavourable reports from different general officers, 1856. Promotion based on the opinion of an individual inspector would be fallacious, 1857.

SIMMONS, Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. L.—*continued.*

General Officers.—Would divide general officers into an active and a retired list; the active list much smaller than now. Would promote direct from a regiment efficient officers only, 1944–1946; without a "five-years' rule," 1947. Intermediate half-pay between holding a regiment and becoming a major-general is most undesirable, 1949.

Brevet-rank, Special Promotion.—Brevet rank for distinguished service has been given too freely of late, 1966, to many who have not deserved it by any special service, 1967, 1968. Promotion, as it works now, is often no reward at all, 1956–1958; though witness gained immensely by it, 1956, 1959–1961; but, in general, it is an advantage to a man, 1962. Has seen a regimental captain command his own lieutenant-colonel in virtue of his army rank of colonel, 1963–1965. Would reserve the power of promotion for really distinguished service, provided a given time had been served in the rank from which promoted, 1952, but the promotion should be substantive, 1953–1955, 1969; and limited to really distinguished service, 2013. Employment has to be found for men promoted substantively, 2014. Thinks a decoration a better mode of reward than money, 1969–1971; but some system might be adopted combining both, 1972.

Retirement Generally.—The retirements offered in the artillery and engineers are insufficient to tempt the officers to give up their better pay and allowances. Hence the desirability of a compulsory system, 1985–1988. Passing to the non-effective list (except for temporary illness) should be a disqualification for further service, 1880. Considers that his scheme of retirement combined with that of reorganization would be less expensive than the present system, 1980, 1981, 2028; but no system of pensions can be adopted without enormous expenditure, unless a reduction of establishments be looked fully in the face, 2029.

Compulsory Retirement.—Would put all generals and lieutenant-generals on the non-effective list at 65, or at any age when they had been 10 years without active command; major-generals at 60, or after 10 years without command; colonels at 55, or after seven years' inactivity; lieutenant-colonels at 50, or after five years inactivity; majors at 45, or after five years' inactivity, 1881, 1882, 1886, 1887, 1916; and captains at forty-two, 1925; an incompetent officer should be retired at once, 1948. Would have no exceptions to the retirement rule, 1889. Those retired compulsorily might be drafted into the militia with a step of rank; counting two years in militia as one towards increase of pension, 1929. Retired officers might still be eligible for civil employment under the War Office, 1949. Has not worked out the effects of these ages on promotion; has taken the periods fixed for the navy, 1890–1892. The number of officers cast out would be large in the higher ranks, 1888.

Voluntary Retirement.—Would allow voluntary retirement, according to the same scale, five years earlier than the age of compulsion, 1923; making 37 years of age the earliest period, 1926. A voluntary retirement to be worth having below this point would be so costly as to be utterly out of the question, 1928; and small lump sums given as a temptation to young officers to retire would be prejudicial to the service and to the young men, encouraging extravagant living and giving an opening to money lenders. The best early retirement for young men who would only enter the army with the idea of serving a few years would be commissions (carrying a step of rank) in the auxiliary forces. A lieutenant after five years' service might be offered a captaincy, after two years as captain a majority. Further, all retiring officers should be liable to serve in the auxiliary forces, if required, 1929.

Scale of Pensions.—Would retire a general on 850*l.* a year after 35 years' service, with 20*l.* added or deducted for each year, more or less, 1909; service with auxiliary forces to count as half-time, half-pay as one-third time, 1911. A lieutenant-general should have 725*l.* a year for 34 years' service, with an annual variation of 15*l.*; and a major-general, 600*l.* for 32 years' service, with a variation of 10*l.* a year; the maximum in every case to be 1,200*l.* a year; and there should be a greater number of field-marshals retiring on 1,200*l.* a year, 1912. Would apply to colonels and all ranks below a scale, ranging from 525*l.* at 55 years of age after 28 years' service to 200*l.*, at 40 years of age after 21 years' service, with an addition or deduction of 10*l.* for every year more or less, 1913–1918. The scale is adapted as far as may be from the navy system, 1919. His maxima would be 600*l.* for a colonel, 400*l.* for lieutenant-colonel, 300*l.* for major, and 250*l.* for captain, 2024.

SIMMONS, Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. L.—*continued.*

Navy System compared.—His plan of retirement is the naval plan, *mutatis mutandis*, 2019, 2020. In the navy believes officers do reach the full service time, 2021, and consider their retirements liberal, 2025. The naval system has been at work five years, 1899; believes it goes on fairly, 1898. The stagnation is nothing to what it was formerly, 1900. As a set-off to the naval time on half pay, has added four years to the service for the army, 2023.

Five Years' Rule.—Would prefer a limit of age to the "five-years' rule" for lieutenant-colonels, 1878.

The Staff.—Considers that the Staff College examination should be more general and more open to all officers without their attending at the Staff College itself; though a certain number may still be educated within it, 1864, 1865. Officers sometimes go to the college with mixed objects, 1866. Thinks officers should pass an examination before getting staff appointments, subject to exceptions in the field, 1866a. Would not interfere with the present system of selection for the staff, except that he would make a condition in peace of having passed certain examinations rather than of having passed the Staff College, 1950. Staff service should, in peace, be limited to five years, and the officer should be ineligible for further staff duty until he had served a certain time in a regiment, 1951. The necessary instruction for the staff might by study and work be obtained without going to a college, 2016, 2017.

Reorganization.—There should be an active establishment smaller than the present numbers, 1883–1885, 1888; in all ranks, 1930. Would organize the infantry in double companies, and the cavalry in squadrons as their units, each double company or squadron to have one major, one captain, and three subalterns, 1930. The existing system is very irregular, 1931–1935, and unintelligible. The establisment should be based on the number of companies and the cadre of officers should oe the same at home or abroad, 1936; always on a war footing, 1937; without constant fluctuations as at present, 1981–1984, filling up the rank and file from the reserve as required, 1936, 1938. Would have for an infantry regiment, exclusive of depôts, one lieutenant-colonel, four majors, four captains, 12 subalterns, one adjutant, one quartermaster. For depôts would adopt the artillery system and aggregate the depôts of seven or eight regiments, 1939. Would have only one field officer, as distinct from the double company officers. Would do away with all special instructors and throw the duty of instructing on the majors. 1,300 combatant officers would be saved in the infantry, 1940; and 205 in the cavalry, 1943. His establishment would not reduce the number of officers below two captains and three subalterns for two companies, 2018. If all branches were similarly organized, injurious supersession would cease; as it has between the artillery and engineers, 1973. Does not see how otherwise it can be avoided, 1974 in the regimental ranks, 1975, 1976, or with the present system, in the rank of major-general, 1977. A dead level is not at all desirable, 1978.

SANDHURST, General the Right Honourable LORD, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Commanding the Forces in Ireland.

System of Promotion.—*The former Rule.*—Under the old régime there was no excluding a man from rank and promotion, even if he were an idiot or a madman, 2212, 2213. A state of things happily now altered, 2214; the test examination shutting out such persons, 2215.

Selection tempered by Seniority.—Promotion should be by selection, tempered by regimental seniority, 2032, 2208. Regimental seniority should be a ground of promotion, but not an exclusive ground, 2033–2036; only a leading ground, if a man is completely fit, for other reasons, 2037–2039. Is opposed to any absolute rule; the selection should be left to the Commander-in-chief, 2040. The regimental senior, though fit, may be too young as compared with other officers of the same arm, 2041. Would not pass a fit man over because one below him might be more fit, 2049–2052; and it is difficult in time of peace to ascertain any special merit, 2059. Few officers would, for regimental reasons, be unfit for promotion up to captain, 2209; and in time of peace seniority must greatly govern promotion, 2219, 2220. Thinks regimental commanding officers might have an initiative in recommending for promotion, explaining fully why any particular officer should be passed over, as in the militia, 2047, 2237, where the commanding officers appear to act for the good of their regiments, 2048. The system mainly differs from that now

SANDHURST, Lord—*continued.*

in force, in that the annual reports are a matter of routine; while reports on which promotion was immediately to be made would involve far more responsibility, 2049–2055. Approves of the regimental system, 2225, and spirit, which is very useful, 2228, 2229; but the regimental idea has greatly changed of late years, 2226, 2227. The power of the Commander-in-chief to promote new blood into a regiment should be frequently used, as being beneficial to the regiment, 2221–2223. Does not think the officers would regard it as a slur, 2224. For five years, carried out all appointments of the Bengal army on the principle of selection, and never found any difficulty, 2244. The only grade for which absolute selection is now practised is that of a general officer exercising a command, 2239–2242. In war, promotion is often too rapid; in peace, it must be slow, 2115.

Colonel.—It was prejudicial to the service to increase the qualification for colonel from three to five years, 2173. Approves of a man being his own master for two or three years before becoming major-general; to be longer on half-pay is undesirable, 2102, 2103.

Confidential Reports.—The confidential reports answer their purpose well; though damaging reports are often apt to be not sufficiently full, 2042, 2056, 2142–2144, 2234–2236: but this arises from a disinclination to report unfavourably—a fault of human nature—not from the form of the report, which is as good as it can be, 2043, 2044, 2231–2233, 2237. Approves of unfavourable reports being made known to the individuals reported on, 2045. It is essential to the honour of the service, 2251. Adverse reports would not be frequent, there being a uniformity of merit among regimental officers, 2058, 2209. Confidential reports should be assisted by information from any other sources available, 2047.

General Officers.—Would divide the general officers into a fixed retired list to which colonels should be promoted by seniority, and an active list, varying in number according to army requirements, filled by selection from the colonels. The retired list not to be debarred from honorary colonelcies, 2091–2098, 2171–2179, 2271. Would abolish temporary and local rank, and the rank of brigadier-general. A colonel selected to command a brigade should become an effective major-general, and five years' service as a major-general should give a right of promotion to lieutenant-general; five more years' service to general. An active major-general should have 500*l.* a year; a lieutenant-general, 600*l.* until he got a regiment. A retired general officer could have 400*l.*, 2098, 2238, 2243. If an officer be once promoted to the active list, would leave him there, if he chose; but he could not claim further promotion, 2101, 2198. It would be hard to force him to leave the active for the retired list if he thereby lost income, 2199, 2200: but when too old for service he could be put on the retired list, if he retained his pay, 2204–2206. It is a question of emolument, 2201. Does not think there would be any addition to the number on the fixed establishment, which is now practically a retired list. If it be increased in cost that could be compensated by some reduction in the scale for the retired list, 2099. Does not propose to apply the general officer's plan to the present generation, 2272. Approves of honorary colonelcies, 2207.

Age.—A man is most fit to command a regiment from 35 to 45; in peace he can do so up to 55; in war he is better to begin at 28; but men vary very much, 2078–2080. A colonel after 60, should be ineligible for promotion to the active list, 2098. A major should retire at 50; a lieutenant-colonel at fifty-five, 2109, 2110.

Brevet-rank.—Does not object at all to brevet-promotion, within due limits, 2164. Brevet-promotion produces anomalies, 2081; but, on the whole, is advantageous when carried on moderately, 2082. It is now given in excess, 2083, 2084, 2165; as formerly it was given too sparingly, 2085. A decoration might be substituted; but it would not give the same substantial advantage to a man, 2087, 2088. Unattached promotion as a substitute failed lamentably, 2089, 2090. Some order of merit for captains and lieutenants would be a good thing; but they would not look upon it as anything like so important as brevet-rank, 2167, 2168. Objects to money rewards, 2169. Other rewards might be combined with brevet, 2170.

The "five-years' rule."—Would rigidly apply the five-years' rule to the new majors, 2280, 2281; making a heavier non-effective charge for majors, 2282. The majors might be re-appointed, 2283, probably in large proportion, 2284, 2289. The rule would thus provide some promotion, and get rid, without hurting them, of unfit officers, 2285.

SANDHURST, LORD—*continued.*

When made in 1871, that was the contemplated action, 2286. Is much in favour of the rule, 2287, 2288; regarded entirely from an efficiency point of view, 2290.

Retirement.—An officer passed over in his regiment should retire, 2046, 2216–2218. To pension off lieutenant-colonels who have served five years with regiments is a question of expense, 2104. Is in favour of compulsory retirement in all grades, 2105; for a captain, if not promoted after 25 years' service, 2106, on 200*l.* a year, 2108; for a major, 50 years of age; lieutenant-colonel, 55, both on full-pay, 2109, 2110. It has not occurred to him to grant allowances also, 2111. Objects to bonuses given to induce officers to retire, 2116. In India, a bonus for retirement lost the Government some of its best officers, 2248.

Army Education: Staff College: Staff.—*Education generally.*—Would devote all Sandhurst to Staff College purposes; and let young officers join their regiments at once, 2156, 2157. Wishes to raise the general standard of army education rather than to have a limited number of very highly educated professors in the army, 2147. An officer requires moral characteristics as much as intellectual qualities, 2252. At the same time, is of opinion that our best officers are those most highly educated, 2063, 2252.

Staff College.—The Staff College is excellent as far as it goes, but not comprehensive enough, 2060. Would prefer a lower standard of entrance and final examinations, and at least a hundred students, 2061, 2067, 2145. The Staff College course needs less high mathematics and more professional knowledge, 2146, 2148, 2149; but would not give successful ones any preference for promotion, 2062. The reward for passing should be in the College itself (like an University degree), but the passed officers should be left to prove in the army their claim to staff service, 2063–2066, 2150, 2151, 2252. Would give scholarships, as rewards, carrying payments, 2150–2152, for a limited time, 2153. The Staff College education is in itself an enormous gain to a man, 2067; but it should be more practical, 2146. Age of admission should be limited, 2154; age rather than rank being the limitation, 2155. Admission would perhaps have to be by competition, or by a test examination, 2068, among those candidates considered suitable. Would not leave the selection to the commanding officer, 2069–2071. The test should turn on intellectual acquirements, 2072. An officer going to the College for unworthy motives should be at once removed, 2073. Would substitute the name "Military" or "Army" for "Staff" College, 2158. Without the Staff College there has not in India been found a deficiency of qualified staff officers; but nine out of ten of those men had gone through some very considerable professional education, 2252.

Staff: Tenure and Re-appointment.—An officer after five years on the staff should return to his regiment, 2159, as a supernumerary on full pay until a vacancy occurred, 2161. The question of re-appointing a staff officer after five years' service should be determined by individual merit, 2074; but the return of a staff officer to his regiment is very salutary, 2075. Would appoint fresh men except in special cases, 2076. An officer continuing to serve on the staff would be a fair case for unattached promotion, 2163.

Staff: Eligibility, Seconding.—Appointments on the staff should not be limited to those who pass the Staff College, 2245, 2246. Holders of staff appointments should be seconded, 2250.

Staff: Majors.—It is a mistake to force officers to give up a staff appointment or to go to half-pay on becoming substantive majors, 2249. Would like to see majors more employed on the staff, being seconded for the purpose, 2075.

Staff: Indian brigades.—Thinks officers to command Indian brigades should be selected and sent out, 2254.

Reorganization. — *Double companies generally.*—Would obtain promotion by re-organization, and have a major for every two companies, 2116–2120, 2127, 2258; and for every cavalry squadron, 2180–2182. The double-companies under majors would meet the difficulty of supersession by artillery majors, 2140. Knows no other mode; the wholesale brevet of two years ago did not cover the difficulty, 2141. It would also be a superior tactical organization for the field, 2261, 2273. It might add to the charge for retirement, 2262–2265. His system would give quicker promotion up to major, though not afterwards, 2276–2278. Double-companies succeeded exceedingly well in the last war, 2275.

Cavalry.—A cavalry cadre should be 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, and 3 captains, 2270. One field officer—the lieutenant-colonel—apart from the squadrons would suffice, 2190, 2191. Should have 10 instead of 12 officers, 2192. The officers would gain in promotion by giving each squadron a major, and the detachment of small bodies would be as easy as now, 2183–2186. Disapproves the reduction which has been made of six to five officers per squadron, 2187–2189.

Infantry.—Would abolish the present battalion majors and have five majors each commanding two companies, 2123–2125; or 200 men, 2126; and all five mounted, 2193–2197; much as a major commands a field battery of artillery, 2128. With double-company organization could suppress two captains per battalion, not otherwise, 2132, 2133. The suppression of two captains would probably cover the extra emoluments of three majors, 2129, 2193, 2260. Such a cadre would be of very great practical advantage in the field, with arms of precision, 2121–2123, 2127. There are not now too many officers; more lieutenants are wanted, 2130, 2134; in India there should be three to a company, 2131, 2266. Our cadre of subalterns is quite insufficient for a campaign, 2135–2137. Would reserve the increase until active service impended, 2138; not adding subalterns at home during peace. The war would provide for the promotion of those added for war, 2139.

Adjutants.—The duty of adjutant qualifies for that of adjutant-general, better than passing through the Staff College. An adjutant might be a captain, and the appointment should be vacated after five years to give a wider experience, 2259.

HODGSON, Lieutenant-General STUDHOLME J.

First Appointments.—The cramming system is most objectionable, 2382. The class of officers who enter the army intending to leave it in a few years is useless and injurious, 2382–2388.

System of Promotion, &c.—Has always been a great enemy to Purchase and to the large establishment of general officers, 2293. Promotions up to lieutenant-colonel should go regimentally by seniority, with as little selection as possible, 2311, 2312, 2350. An officer should not be made an effective field-officer under 10 years' service, nor a lieutenant-colonel under 15 years' service, 2351–2353. Too rapid promotion in a regiment would have, as heretofore, to be modified by bringing in others from another corps, 2354. Promotion by merit would not answer at all, 2355. The authorities would receive general support in removing an officer either for inefficiency or for bad character, 2357–2359. Promotion in a regiment of one officer over another would cause a most dangerous discontent, 2337–2339. A man passed over as inefficient should leave the regiment, 2340. The 100 senior colonels should have 200*l.* or 250*l.* extra; but no claim to promotion on account of seniority, 2297, 2298, 2300, 2310.

Confidential Reports.—Confidential reports are not minute enough, 2342; nor made in a sufficiently unflinching spirit, 2343–2347. More rigid exactness should be required from the commanding officer and the inspecting general, 2348–2350. It is the duty and practice of an inspecting general to correct an insufficient report, 2360–2364.

Brevet-Rank.—Brevet-rank is a fatal system, 2321, 2324. Would abolish it altogether, 2322; and substitute unattached promotion, or promotion to another regiment, 2323–2326.

General Officers.—Would limit the establishment, during peace, to 100 major-generals and 25 lieutenant-generals, 2295, 2300. All promoted from colonels by selection regardless of seniority, 2296, 2300. There should be an active and an unlimited retired list. Lieutenant-generals should retire compulsorily at 65, major-generals at 60, on their full pay, with, as opportunity offered, 200*l.* added. Lieutenant-generals should have 1,000*l.* a year; major-generals 800*l.* a year. Those retiring optionally might, to a limited number, have 200*l.* a year added to their pensions, 2300–2308. Would reserve the rank of general for special cases, 2377, 2381. Our lieutenant-general corresponds to a French general of division, 2378–2380. Refers to the future, a new army, 2299.

Retirement.—A lieutenant-colonel should not be left at the head of a regiment after 55; a major should be retired at 45; a captain at 40, if not promoted (Ordnance Corps excepted), 2313, 2314, 2319, 2320; with a pension or unattached rank with the prospect of further employment, 2315, 2316. The pension should be full pay after

HODGSON, Lieut.-Gen.—*continued.*

25 years' service, 2317, 2318. Would only give a lump sum to those who had not served long enough for a pension, 2389. Under 15 years' service, it might not be unfair to offer 100*l.* for each year's actual service, 2390–2394.

Staff: Staff-College.—Staff appointments are much coveted, as an escape from barrack life, 2366. It would be a grievance in the army if, in the absence of a separate staff corps, the same men continuously held the staff appointments, 2327, 2328. Would extend the Staff College; but second the officers at it, 2329, 2330. When he commanded a regiment, could not have picked out any officers as fit for other staff employment than that of aide-de-camp, 2375, 2376.

Organization.—Large companies commanded by majors would be injurious to the regimental system, 2371; and cause conflict of authority, 2372. The majors would not cheerfully do captain's duty, 2373; captains with brevet-rank do so reluctantly, 2374. The cadre of officers is sufficient; but all are wanted with the regiments, 2331–2337.

ADYE, Brigadier General Sir JOHN, K.C.B., R.A., Director of Artillery and Stores, War Office.

The Artillery System.—Artillery differs, to some extent, from the line in organisation, 2398. Promotion is entirely by seniority, on one list for the whole corps, without any exception beyond a few subalterns who have been passed over for not having qualified for captain, 2400–2404. An officer unfit for promotion may have been retired; but is not aware of any being passed over, 2405, 2408–2410. The unfitness of an officer would be known by the confidential reports, 2406; which apply to the artillery as to the rest of the army, 2407. Promotion has not been satisfactory, because the proportions of the ranks have not enabled it to be so, 2411. No system of promoting one man by merit over the heads of others could be satisfactory in a large list like the artillery, 2412–2414. It is not a case where a man can be brought in from another regiment, 2415. An officer superseded would have to leave the service, 2416. Artillery officers may obtain promotion by brevet; but there is no unattached list, 2417–2419; except a few officers on temporary sick half-pay, 2420, 2421. There are some colonels unemployed; but on full pay and ready for employment at any moment, like general officers, 2422, 2423. The rate of promotion in the artillery has varied greatly. It is now beginning to suffer retardation; and that was considered when Lord Cardwell made great changes in the proportions of the ranks, which ought to be carried out in other branches, 2424. Among other changes, the first captains were made substantive majors, 2425, 2426. One subaltern of each garrison battery was reduced, 2427. On the whole the number of officers was reduced, 2428–2430; though the pay list was increased, it being considered better to spend money in retaining officers rather than in pensions to officers doing nothing, 2431. The changes were partially applied to the Indian cadres, 2432. They have been successful, and should be applied to other arms, 2433. The artillery has been superseded by other branches in every rank, which is undesirable, 2561, 2590. The balance has not been turned the other way. The artillery are still superseded, 2562–2572, 2591. A little improvement is yet wanted, 2638. Would prefer selection to seniority for promotion in the artillery; but does not see his way to it, 2598–2603. Artillery officers will take 20 years to become majors, 2574, 2635, 2638. There were majors in the artillery before 1826, who were converted to lieutenant colonels, 2588, 2589. The artillery colonel on the staff does the duty of a brigadier-general, 2584, 2585. In the artillery the proportion of officers is less than in the cavalry, 2647; at home, 2648. Retirements consist of full pay after 30 years restricted by a fixed sum, 2576–2579; half pay after 25 years' service, 2580; or on 600*l.* a year after 40 years' service without limit, 2454, 2455. The list is not full, 2456. Colonels are at present reluctant to retire, being abnormally young, and holding appointments worth 1,000*l.* a year, 2581–2583, 2639. There ought to be compulsory retirement in the higher ranks, which with other reorganisation would produce sufficient promotion, 2632–2634.

First Appointments.—Approves entrance by competitive examination, and the examinations for promotion, 2558, 2559. Both in artillery and line the candidates for commissions exceed the vacancies, 2530. Under competition better educated men enter the army, who will

ADYE, Brig. Gen. Sir J.—*continued.*

probably study more while in it, 2615; but doubts whether they will constitute more a professional class than hitherto, 2616–2619. Hopes the mixture of rich and poor men will continue, 2620. In the Crimea, there was a broad line in the French army between officers from the ranks and those of a better class of life, 2621–2624. The former had not the same authority with their men as our officers have, 2625.

System of Promotion.—Would meet the difficulties of promotion by readjusting the ranks, encouraging retirement at the top, and giving outlets to juniors. The Indian Staff Corps provides for 95 annually, 2508. The brigade depôts help promotions to lieutenant-colonel, 2441; but doubts if officers will become lieutenant-colonels in 25 years during peace, 2489, 2490. Objects to extend the area for seniority promotion beyond the regiment, 2629–2631. Officers can be reported on at any time if necessary, 2597.

Age.—A man is fit to command a regiment at any age after 30; but should not remain after 55, 2498; forty is the most efficient age for it, 2499, 2500. Field officers should be in the prime of life, 2501, 2502. A captain should not be promoted after 47, nor a major after 50, *ib.* 2672. An army with the oldest lieutenant-colonel under 55 would have younger officers than most European armies, 2669.

Brevet-rank.—Sees no substitute for brevet-promotion, 2546; disapproves of pension and decoration as failing to bring the officer forward in the service, 2547. The advantages of brevet-promotion outweigh its anomalies, as bringing forward distinguished officers without losing their services, which unattached promotion would fail to do, 2538–2541, 2548, 2550. It should be limited to really distinguished service, 2542–2545, 2596.

General Officers.—A major-general should have power to retire after 60 on 600*l.* a year, and be compelled to do so at any age if for five years without a command; a lieutenant-general optionally at 65, compulsorily after five years' non-employment, on 800*l.* a year; a general optionally on 1,200*l.*, or compulsorily after five years non-employment. Would have a small fixed active list and an unlimited retired list; the retired generals being eligible for administrative employment, 2457–2465, 2468, 2470, 2472–2474. The active list should be somewhat larger than the number of commands, 2466; and colonels should be promoted to it by seniority throughout all branches of the army, 2469, 2471. This is the navy system as regards the upper ranks, but does not copy it by introducing compulsory retirement in lower ranks; believes the naval system will produce sufficient promotion, 2475–2477.

"Five-Years' Rule."—Approves the five-year rule for lieutenant-colonels, but thinks the commander-in-chief should be empowered to extend it to seven, 2442–2444. Should not under his proposed re-organization require to enforce the five years' rule for majors, 2446, 2478.

Retirement.—*Generally.*—Believes early retirement is a mistake, as withdrawing good rather than inefficient officers, 2447, 2503–2507. The evidence of the actuaries before Mr. Vivian's Committee, in 1870, convinced him that it is better to spend money on retirements high up, and to secure promotion by altering the proportion of ranks (thus securing less entries), than to have retirement low down, 2604–2611, 2626–2628. Non-employment should be coupled with age as a reason for compulsory retirement, 2447. Compulsory retirement at the top is indispensable, 2520. Would allow full-pay retirement to all officers of 30 years' service, 2448. Would not object to retain the half-pay retirement after 25 years, 2491–2493. It is not much accepted in the artillery, 2495. Believes that in the future it would be taken as in the past, by officers of means not wishing to serve on, 2496, 2497.

Captains and Subalterns.—Does not think it should be taken for granted that officers of the lower ranks who retired under purchase will not retire now, 2521–2523. The royal artillery is not analogous, the officers being men of less means than the rest of the army, 2524–2529. Would open the appointments of officers in the police, constabulary, and gaols to junior officers of the army; also paymasterships. Captains might be transferred to the commissariat and ordnance store departments as deputy commissaries, the lower ranks in those departments being then warrant officers promoted from non-commissioned officers. The arrangement would be cheaper, more efficient, and good for recruiting, 2516–2518, 2612, 2613, 2649–2655. A captain after 15 years' service might be

ADYE, Brig.-Gen. Sir J.—*continued.*

allowed half pay for a limited term of 10 years conditionally on serving in the militia, 2447, 2448, 2481, 2509, 2614, 2636, 2637, 2656–2658. If a fourth of the militia captains came from the army for 10 years there would be annually open to the army 39 vacancies, 2509–2513. The localization scheme will render this process more practicable, 2515. Captains should be ineligible for promotion after 47; have optional retirement after 25 years' service on 200*l.*, and compulsory retirement at 50 on 250*l.* a year, 2672.

Majors.—The majors, if not promoted, could retire on full pay after 30 years' service, 2479. Majors should be ineligible for promotion after 50 years of age, and be compulsorily retired at 53 on full pay, 2672.

A *lieutenant-colonel* at 55 should be removed from a regiment; be eligible for the staff or a brigade depôt, and remain for promotion to major-general, or have option of retiring on 400*l.* a year, 2448, 2484; but if not a general at 60, or at any age if not employed for seven years, should be retired on 400*l.* a year, 2449, in all arms, being more than the full pay of a lieutenant-colonel, 2452.

Organization.—To prevent supersession would organize the proportions between the ranks (and the outlets) on the same principles for all arms, 2573, 2587. Infantry should be organised by double companies, and cavalry by squadrons, under majors, 2434. Would have in a battalion, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 5 majors, 6 captains (one of them adjutant), and 14 subalterns, 2435–2437, 2640. The double-company arrangement would be more efficient in the field, and a few subalterns could be spared without injury to the service, 2531–2534. Considers that the success of a regiment in the field depends more upon its experienced officers than on its young subalterns, 2595. The reorganization would cost no more; because of the suppression of three junior officers, 2661. With double companies, the major would have a responsible command much earlier than he now has, 2644, 2645, 2662. Does not think there would in the field be more mortality among officers than hitherto, 2535. Does not think the majors would shirk any regimental duties, 2536, 2537. Has heard that the Germans are in doubt as to retaining their double companies, 2641–2643.

The Staff: Military Education.—Would adhere to the five years' rule for the staff, especially the lower ranks, 2551; with occasional exceptions, 2552, 2553. Would not give all staff appointments to Staff College men, 2554. Army experience generally is the best school for staff officers, 2555–2557, 2663. Our staff officers are the best in the world, 2663; considers the present means of professional education sufficient, 2664. At Woolwich the instruction is both technical and professional, 2665; artillery officers derive great advantage from this professional training, 2666. Sees no objection to a similar college for young officers of the line, 2667.

COOKE, Captain WILLIAM, 22nd Regiment.

The Staff College.—*Entrance.*—Was two years at the Staff College, 2678. Entered it by competitive examination, 2682, 2683; not a sharp competition, 2695. Men went to the College from various motives, the majority to improve themselves, 2684, 2685, 2758; with a view to qualifying for staff service, 2717, 2718. For the entrance examination believes men cram considerably, 2759. Cramming will increase with the number of competitors, 2762. Would not diminish the tests, 2701–2703; which do not keep off candidates, 2704, 2705. There are 20 vacancies annually at the College, 2710; a sufficient number 2709. There are 40 students, 2711. *The Course.*—A student must attend a certain number of lectures, and there are periodical examinations. There are no other means of enforcing industry, 2687–2689; and a man could not be removed till the end of the first year, 2690; but would scarcely get beyond that if he did not study, 2748. Such removals were very rare, 2692. Whether students work hard depends on ability and inclination, 2693, and previous training, 2694. Some men work very hard, 2749. At the College felt the advantage of having been at Sandhurst, 2694, 2740, 2760, 2761. Military technical subjects and foreign languages carry most weight at the College, 2743, 2744. Has found the knowledge gained of very great assistance when attending the manœuvres of foreign armies, 2746, 2747. Believes every officer must have a horse, 2753. A pack of drag hounds is now kept, 2754, and after study the officers go out with them, 2755.

Final Examination.—Military subjects form the principal, though not the exclusive test, 2696. The test was not too high in any subject except artillery, 2697–2699. An officer who has passed the College cannot claim staff employment, 2728. Every officer appointed to the staff should be at once seconded, 2731–2736. To induce men to undergo the severe study, it is essential that they should be appointed to staff posts, 2706, 2708, or have a sufficient pecuniary prize, 2757; though some of the lower staff positions might be held by men less highly educated, 2707.

COOKE, Capt.—*continued.*

The System of Military Education.—Prefers the present system to a more extended education of officers at a lower standard, 2700. The study is mainly in technical military subjects, 2712, which would render an officer more efficient for general military duty, 2714; on which ground it would be desirable to increase the number of officers passing through, 2715, 2741, 2756. Not exactly a staff college but a military college on a larger scale, 2720, 2721, for all officers to pass through before obtaining promotion, 2724, in a short course, unless they choose to pass a similar examination direct, without the College course, 2725. Regimental experience is not all which is necessary, 2726.

CLARKE, Captain F. C. H., Royal Artillery.

Was two years at Staff College, 2769. When he passed in, there were 28 to 30 candidates for 15 vacancies, 2770. Most of the officers went to the Staff College with a view to obtaining staff appointments, 2771, 2772; with one or two in each batch who go to avoid foreign or distasteful duties, 2773. There are half-yearly examinations, 2774; and a final one, 2775, the graduation in which depends entirely on proficiency in the examination, 2777, 2778. The subjects are military, or bear on military matters, 2779, 2780. A certain number of attendances at lectures is obligatory; but no other means to enforce hard work, 2781, 2782. The large majority pass the examination at the end of the first year, 2783, 2784; and also the final examination, 2794–2796. It is the duty of the commandant to report the cases of those who do not pass satisfactorily, 2785; but no officer was removed on such grounds while witness was at the College, 2786, so that practically it is a two years course for all, 2787; but officers who have been at Woolwich could pass out in less time, 2820–2822. The standard is not too high, 2788; would not lower it at all, 2789, 2793. Having been a cadet at Addiscombe helped witness, 2790–2792. Higher mathematics had a slight advantage over other subjects in point of marks, 2797–2799; but few ran the risk of failing in it, 2800–2802. It is not needed for the general staff of the army, 2803. Men would not go into the College for the mere inducement of a sort of degree, 2804, 2806. Thinks that officers get at present sufficient instruction for the general purposes of the service, 2807, at Sandhurst, Woolwich, Chatham, or from garrison instructors, 2808–2810. It is difficult to say whether the test is higher at Woolwich or the Staff College, 2811–2819; except as regards higher mathematics, where the Staff College is higher, 2824. Required to be two years under the competent professors of the Staff College for the higher military sciences desirable for staff officers, 2823. Believes there are now 40 officers at the College, 2825. Thinks 100 officers would enter annually if it took so many, 2826; which would be an advantage to the service, 2827.

BULLER, Major REDVERS, 60th Regiment.

Staff College.—*Personal experience.*—Went to Staff College to remain in England and effect a transfer to another battalion, 2926. When he entered there were 50 candidates for 20 vacancies, 2833, 2834. Captain Lendy crams most of the candidates; a month's cramming under him cost witness 40*l.* 2838–2841. Had been nearly two years at Staff College when he left to go to the Gold Coast, 2831, 2832. Wasted time in military drawing, 2918, which should have been acquired before entry, 2919; but no college education could teach the details of his staff office, 2930, 2931.

The Students.—More care should be taken in selecting officers to be allowed to compete, 2866–2869, so that only the best professionally should go up, 2870, who had done well at Sandhurst and in garrison instruction, 2888. It is difficult to get an accurate report upon a candidate, 2924, 2925. Officers enter too young; would exclude subalterns unless about to be promoted, 2929. At College there is some allowance towards the mess, 2893, but officers going there incur pecuniary sacrifice, 2894. Some years ago the College had a bad name, but now it is popular and

BULLER, Major—*continued.*

attractive, 2895, 2896. Fears that one half the men there go for other reasons than the desire to get staff appointments, 2835, 2836, 2855. It is hard work to get in, but very pleasant when you are there, 2837; and anybody who can get in can go through, 2842–2845. A man could pass well with two hours study daily besides his lectures, 2917. All the men at the College would not be fit for the staff, 2906, 2907, though some unfit ones work very hard, 2920, 2921. Some are rejected at the end of the first year, 2845–2847. It would benefit the army if the number of officers at the Staff College were increased, 2871, 2872, 2885. A larger number would be ready to go there, 2873, even without a claim to staff appointments, 2874; but would still reserve it for officers training for the staff, 2887.

The Course.—The mathematics is now only elementary, 2848–2852, and could hardly be further reduced, 2853. Would substitute practical out-door training in tactics for some of the book instruction, 2875–2879. More reconnaissance and less surveying, 2913. With the present facilities for garrison instruction, would require the whole of present first year's course at Staff College to be known before entry, making the second year's course that for the first year, 2862–2865, 2880–2884, 2914–2916. The practical work becomes more important each year, 2908, 2909. When serving in the field in Ashantee, found benefit from studies at Staff College, 2910, 2911; though practical training was deficient, 2912.

Claim to Staff Appointments.—Passing the College should not give any claim whatever to a staff appointment, 2854, 2856, 2857; though, except for service in the field, staff appointments should be limited to those who had been there, 2858–2861. Officers who go there consider that there is an engagement to give them staff appointments, 2897. Nearly all who pass do get staff employment, 2898. Thinks officers who go to the College should get something for it, 2899, 2900. A term of staff appointment should enable the officer to return to his regiment in a higher rank, 2901–2904. It would be a claim to promotion by selection after trial, 2905.

Extension of the System.—Before garrison instructors were appointed a young officer had no means of learning professional details, 2890. Prefers garrison instructors to an extended military college for young officers, 2892.

Brevet Promotion.—Should be sorry to see a good service pension substituted for brevet promotion as an option, 2935, 2944; but if the pension were a definite reward for a definite duty sees no objection to it, 2945.

MACLEAN, Lieutenant-Colonel H. J., commanding 3rd Battalion, Rifle Brigade.

The "five-years rule" is undoubtedly advantageous to regiments, 2953, both for promotion and as infusing new blood into the command, 2954. Expects to be 12 years on half pay before becoming major-general, 2956, 3061, at the age of sixty-four, 2961; when he will be too old for the work, 2962. Officers completing their five years would accept retirement if the pension were at all commensurate with previous income, 2963, 2969, 2970, that is, as good if they continued in command, 2964–2968. From the proportions of ranks there is a block at the head of the captains' list, 2971. It would be an advantage to the service if captains, after a certain service, were compulsorily retired, 2972. Lump sums to officers of short service would induce many to retire and aid promotion, 2975; the scale should be graduated, with a marked distinction in favour of foreign service, 2976–2978. Would take the regiment as the unit of promotion, with exceptions to equalise promotion, 2979, 2980, 3033, 3053. The army would prefer equalised promotion, 2981–2983, which a larger promotion into other regiments would effect, 2984–2987, 3034–3036. Bringing in a man occasionally to a regiment does not hurt it, 3042. Would be chary of giving promotion for passing an intellectual examination, which may fail to show the best men, 2988. Information must always be useful to a man, 2989. Would require six years' service for promotion to captain, 3037, 3038; 12 to 13 before promotion to major, 3039. An officer passed over ought to retire, as in the German system, 2998–3001. The temporary character of local rank is a drawback to an otherwise desirable system, 3015–3017, 3046. Should not like officers to continue serving who had passed the point at which they could be promoted, 3018; retirement should there be compulsory, 3020–3022; though an option of staying for a short time might be allowed,

MACLEAN, Lieut.-Col.—*continued.*

3019, 3023, 3024. Is in favour of free exchange between linked battalions, 3009, whereby officers exchanging would not have to go to the bottom of the list, 3010–3014, 3057, 3058. A decoration, carrying pension, would be fairer to the officers at large than brevet promotion, 2992–2994; but would retain brevet to bring on deserving men, 2995. It has been too lavishly distributed, 2996, 2997. Does not see why an officer who has passed the Staff College should be dissatisfied on returning to his regiment, 3049–3052. Should not have any difficulty in selecting the officers of his battalion best adapted for the staff, 3063, 3064. Double companies under majors would benefit promotion, 3003; and, in the field, would be more efficient than the present system, 3005, 3007, 3008. One man dismounted could command 250 if properly backed up, 3043. There are not now too many officers, 3006.

HUDSON, Major JAMES, 84th Regiment.

Agrees generally with Colonel Maclean, 3070, 3107. Where quick promotion is caused by war or bad climate the juniors in the regiment, however young, should not lose the succession, 3071, 3072. Where an officer is brought in from another regiment there should be an obvious reason for it, 3073–3080. A man passed over in the regiment, or in consequence of whose incompetence an officer is brought in from another regiment, ought certainly to retire, 3081–3084. Would object to allow an officer to serve on after passing limit of age for promotion, 3101–3106. Would abolish brevet rank entirely, provided some substitute (as unattached promotion or promotion to another regiment to a small extent) were found for cases of distinguished service; a decoration, accompanied by pecuniary reward, would be preferable to brevets, 3085–3090, 3116–3119, nd satisfactory to the army, 3121–3124. There is the impression in the army that brevet goes by interest, 3120. Thinks the five years' rule a good rule, 3091; lieutenant-colonels at the end of the five years would be likely to accept retirement, 3092–3094. A compulsory retirement for captains would be an excellent thing after 25 years' service, 3095, 3096; with an earlier optional retirement on a lump sum, as in the purchase system, 3097–3100. In calculating retirement, approves of two years' home service only counting as one year's foreign service, 3121, 3122. Thinks a double company would be too much for one officer to look after, 3108–3115.

BORTON, Captain CHARLES, 14th Foot.

Thinks promotion from captain to major should be on a general list for the arm of service by army seniority, 3129–3132, 3152–3154, if the senior were qualified, 3133. Thinks this is a general opinion, 3134–3136. Would deal with the lieutenant-colonel's step in the same way, 3137. Approves of compulsory retirement for captains after 25 years' service, 3138; but would not let any man stay after being once passed over, 3139–3141. Would abolish brevet, and substitute decoration and pension, 3142, 3143; with transfer of very distinguished officers to other regiments by direct promotion, 3144. Brevet is not liked by the army, 3145–3147. There should be a minimum service for promotion, 3148–3150. Promotions into a regiment do not interfere more with the regimental system than exchanges, 3155, which are very numerous in regiments going to India, 3156. Officers dislike doing the duty of others who are students at the Staff College, 3158. If they were seconded that feeling would have no place, 3160.

DEMPSTER, Captain THOMAS CARROLL, 24th Foot.

Prefers general promotion throughout the branch of the service to regimental promotion, 3164–3170. Agrees with Colonel Maclean as to compulsory retirement, 3171; optional retirement at early ages would be accepted, 3172. Would abolish brevet and substitute decorations (with pensions), or actual promotion, 3173–3176. Thinks the double company organization would be an advantage in the field; but some company duties might be unacceptable to majors, 3177–3184.

SWINBURNE, Lieutenant PAUL, 80th Foot.

Would give a man passed over a second chance; forced retirement might be ruin to a poor man, 3189,

SWINBURNE, Lieut.—*continued.*

3190. Would like promotion to be general throughout the army, 3192. Has been very unfortunate in regard to promotion, 3192–3197, and is beyond help, 3201. Compulsory retirement for captains after 25 years' service would prevent the recurrence of such a block as has happened in the 80th Foot, 3198–3200. It is the only way out of the difficulty, 3201. Doubts if many subalterns would accept voluntary retirement, 3202–3205. Disapproves of brevet rank, 3206, 3207. The general feeling is for compulsory retirement of captains, provided the pension be adequate, 3208–3211, not less than 250*l.* a year, *i.e.*, his pay and allowances, 3212, 3213; optionally after 20 years' service, compulsorily after 25 years, 3214, 3215. Does not see that the shifting of officers from regiment to regiment on promotion would do more harm than exchanges, 3220; though it would be more frequent, 3221. The 80th Regiment is composed of officers brought in from all quarters, but there is a strong family feeling in it, 3224, 3225.

GOUGH, Lieutenant the Honourable GEORGE, 14th Hussars.

Entered the army by a competitive examination since Purchase was abolished, 3299, 3250. Many join (now, as formerly,) with the intention only of serving a few years, 3232–3239. They would leave without a money inducement, but would rather have money than not on leaving, 3241–3243. The same class of men enter as before Purchase was abolished, 3238. Cavalry captains have not as a rule 25 years' service, 3244, 3245. There is a strong feeling against officers at the Staff College, because they go there for their own advantage, and their duties are thrown upon others, 3248.

AMHERST, Lieutenant the Honourable JEFFERY C., Rifle Brigade.

Thinks compulsory retirement for captains after 25 years' service would be willingly accepted by the army, 3255 (though perhaps not by the individuals affected, 3256, 3257), and a voluntary retirement after 20 years, 3258. Does not think any inducement necessary under 20 years' service, 3259–3264. Thinks a decoration with a reward would be preferable to brevet, 3265–3268. To bring in officers from other regiments would be unpopular, 3269, 3270. An officer passed over ought to retire at once, 3271. Entered the army by purchase, with a qualifying examination, 3272–3275. A crammer is a most useful thing, enabling many good officers to get into the army, 3276.

STRATHNAIRN, General the Right Honorable Lord, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

System of Promotion.—Promotion by seniority as a rule should be regimental, subject to special exceptions, 3277–3281. A man should not be promoted over others in his own regiment except for some remarkable action, 3282. For promotion by merit, the regimental commanding officer and the inspecting general have between them sufficient means for forming an opinion, 3283–3286. Promising officers should be selected for the staff or for promotion in other regiments, 3293. When commander-in-chief in India, promoted by merit, 3294, in the Indian army, 3307, in all ranks, 3298, without the slightest difficulty, 3295–3297. It awakened zeal remarkably, 3302. Promotion by selection for merit is perfectly feasible, 3303; and public opinion in the army quite went with it, 3304. It is well known in each regiment who are the efficient men, 3305. An inefficient officer ought to be removed from the army before he becomes a captain, 3333–3339; before he is debarred by age from other employment, 3334. It is not desirable that a colonel after leaving a regiment should be long on half-pay, 3353.

Confidential Reports.—The confidential reports are admirable in theory, but lose prestige by being called "confidential," 3288, 3378, 3379. An officer reported against should be told of it, 3299. There may be certain offences reported on which it would be bad to publish, 3290. On the report, would give an unfit man another chance, 3291, but an inveterately dull or objectionable officer should be removed from the service, 3292.

Age for Lieutenant-Colonels.—Seven or eight years ought to qualify for the command of a regiment, 3309–3313. In peace an officer ought not to have much above 20 years' service before getting a regiment, or he becomes tired and slack, 3315, 3316.

STRATHNAIRN, Lord.—*continued.*

Brevet-rank.—Brevet-rank has of late been too lavishly bestowed, 3324; but the system is advantageous if given in reward of distinguished merit, 3325. It is difficult to find other promotion, 3326. A decoration, with a pension, would be desirable as a reward, 3330; but a small pension would be valueless comparatively to an officer who was well off, 3331; and perhaps the mixing of money and honour would not be good, 3332.

Staff.—Objects to confining staff appointments to men from the Staff College, the regiment is the best school for military command, which is to learn discipline, 3317–3321, 3390–3392. The five years' limit to staff appointments is good, if administered with judgment and exceptions are allowed, 3322, 3323.

Retirement.—A man may be a good captain, but not fit to command a regiment; he should have a pension, 3340–3343, 3393. Approves of pensioning captains not promoted after 20 years' service, 3344, 3345. Inefficient lieutenant-colonels should be made to retire, 3355–3359. Public works and other non-combatant appointments should be thrown open to officers, 3360, 3361. Under the purchase system there was no difficulty in getting rid of an inefficient officer, 3362–3364, 3397–3400; to bring him to a court-martial would be an extreme measure, 3365. The Indian system of pensions for length of service without reference to rank works very well, 3394–3396.

Five Years' Rule.—Disapproves the "five years' rule" for lieutenant-colonels, 3346. A good commanding officer is too valuable to be so removed, 3347–3350, 3367–3369, 3373. Promotion is too dearly gained by such a rule, 3351, 3352, 3375; but would retain it, to get quit of inefficient officers, 3370; though they ought to go sooner, 3371, 3372.

Reorganization.—The squadron organization failed, 3401–3403. Considers that squadrons and double companies under majors would be a desirable change, 3380–3384; but no officers ought to be reduced, 3385, 3386, 3404; least of all the flank majors, 3407–3409. In the Prussian system there is too great extension of line for our troops, 3388, 3389.

PEARS, Major-General, Sir THOMAS, K.C.B., Military Secretary, India Office.

Indian Staff Corps.—The Staff Corps were formed deliberately as a substitute for the regimental system in India, 3508, 3509, as a permanent institution, 3510. In the Indian Staff Corps promotion up to colonel is given after so many years service, 3412. Since the transfer from the Indian service no colonels have been promoted to be general officers, 3414; when they do come up for promotion they will be in larger proportion than the strength of the Staff Corps justifies, 3415–3420; an undesirable state of things, 3421, 3453; and one to be avoided if possible, 3515, 3516. Considers the preponderance of Staff Corps colonels to be temporary, 3422–3427, 3507; but will be seriously disproportionate for the next 30 years, 3428–3431. Every Staff Corps lieutenant-colonel becomes a colonel in five years, whether on furlough or not, 3560, 3561; but the relative number becoming colonels depends on the number of lieutenant-colonels feeding them under any particular organization, 3562-3566. Does not think the rank of colonel can be refused to Staff Corps officers, because they have not done military duty, being promised in the Royal Warrant; but sees no reason why certain military duty should not be required to have been performed within a given time for promotion to general officer, 3523, 3524; the rule being applied to the British army as well, 3525. Most of the most eminent men in Indian military history have spent much of their lives in civil or political duties, 3526–3528. It is a mistake to suppose that colonels' allowances are guaranteed to Staff Corps officers after 38 years' service for all time; it only applies to certain existing officers, 3461–3464. Extra bonuses are now inducing many retirements, 3465, 3468; which were retarded by the arrangement as to colonels' allowances, 3466. The bonus consisted in offering the present value of the future colonel's allowance according to an actuarial calculation, 3469–3471. It was a saving to the Indian Government, 3472, 3473.

An age-limit for Major-General.—Proposed to have a limit of age (61 or 62) for promotion to major-general on the fixed establishment; this excluded more Staff Corps than British colonels, 3432–3437, and so gave the promotions in a fairer proportion, 3438, 3439. Actuaries' report, No. 56, is on this scheme, 3440, and shews

PEARS, Maj.-Gen. Sir T.—*continued.*

the great effect, 3441–3444. Does not know why this scheme dropped. Was strong on the point of applying one rule to both services, 3445. To the Indian colonels it made no financial difference, having already colonel's allowances, 3446, 3447, 3449; the difficulty was to give suitable pensions to the British colonels, 3448. Thinks the age-limit should be permanent, 3458. The limit of age could not be applied to the local officers, 3517, (but they will be hereafter so young that it will not be necessary, 3518, 3573,) because of "Henley's guarantee," 3519. Promotion in the local army will, as years pass, become very slow, and though the last officers promoted to be major-generals will be young men they will be old colonels, 3572–3576.

Separation of the Lists of General Officers.—Sees no objection to a total separation of the lists, except the inevitable question of supersession, 3422–3425. Supersession is of every-day occurrence, probably in every army, 3552, and cannot be cured unless the whole army be put on one seniority list, which is undesirable, 3553–3558. With separate lists of general officers there must be supersession of British by Indian colonels, or vice versâ, 3450–3452, 3456. The amalgamated list would set itself right in the remote future, and meanwhile prevents supersession, 3453–3455. A separation of the lists would interfere with the promotion of local Indian officers, 3474–3482; and would necessitate a revision of the system now adopted for ante-dating promotions of British general officers, 3483–3489, 3570, which would hardly be applied to Staff Corps officers on a separate list, 3490. A system of ante-dates to prevent supersession by either list might possibly be worked, 3494–3497, 3567. Thinks supersession, speaking generally, rather a good thing, 3498, so long as the organization is fixed to give a fair average promotion, 3499–3501. Does not think the Indian officers attach much importance to the amalgamation, 3502–3505, 3511. The colonels of the Staff Corps causing the difficulty are old company's colonels, 3506. Does not suppose British officers would object to a separation of the general's lists, 3512. In case of a separation of the lists would absorb the steps the British colonels have had from the Indian list, and leave the Staff Corps vacancies till the officers' turn comes, 3577–3579. The expense of extra major-generals has fallen on the British Government, 3580.

Artillery and Engineers.—Is not aware of the supersession of British by Indian artillery officers, 3531–3535. Does not think an amalgamated list of artillery lieutenant-colonels would give satisfaction, 3536, 3550, 3553. The Indian cadres are dying out, and till they do there must be four seniority lists in the artillery, 3537–3548. The Indian artillery and engineers should have the option of retiring under any rules applied to the corresponding British corps, 3529, 3530.

Local Rank in India.—Disapproves giving local rank in India as against the Staff Corps officers; it is a one-sided process, 3520–3522.

RADCLIFFE, Colonel ROBERT PARKER, R.A., Deputy Adjutant-General of Artillery.

Royal Artillery: Present State.—Stagnation is now among the captains and the lieutenant-colonels, 3685–3688; but will be greater, 3691–3694, 3725. Considers that a man should become captain after 10 years' service, major after 16, lieutenant-colonel after 24 years, 3689. The present not unsatisfactory state of things is partly due to augmentations, 3696–3699. The officers came in 80 or 90 at a time, 3634. There are 974 officers, including the general officers, 3650, 3651. A great many of the colonels are nearly of the same age as the lieutenant-colonels, 3681; a fact partly due to extraordinary circumstances, 3682, 3683. There is an interval of six years between senior and junior captain, 3760–3762; the same between senior and junior majors, 3763–3765; and seven years between senior and junior lieutenant-colonels, 3766. About 8 or 10 colonels and lieutenant-colonels can be made supernumerary when the majors exceed 25 years' service, 3736; so that affords but small relief, and it is only temporary as the supernumeraries have to be absorbed when the senior major falls below 25 years, 3737–3741. Hands in a return showing the annual vacancies in the rank of captain, 3742. The full colonel only takes his rank from his brevet colonelcy, 3750–3755. Colonels are now dissociated from brigades, and some have district commands, 3720–3722. The brigade is commanded by its senior lieutenant-colonel, 3723, 3724. An honorary colonel of Horse Artillery has 1,200*l.* a year, of Foot Artillery,

RADCLIFFE, Colonel—*continued.*

1,000*l.* a year, 3766*a*. Officers of the Indian Artillery cadres are guaranteed promotion in their own lists 3730–3735.

Royal Artillery: Existing Retirements. — There is no retirement in the Artillery except on half-pay, under medical board, until after 25 years' service, 3583–3586, 3607. After 25 years' service any officer is entitled to retire on the half-pay of his rank, 3587–3589, 3606; but scarcely any ever do so, 3631–3632. After 30 years' he may retire on full-pay, 3590–3595; if a colonel he gets 600*l.* a year, (less a deduction fixed by actuaries according to his gains under the Warrant of 1872, and certain changes, 3599–3603,) but only 474*l.* is taken out of the vote for 42,400*l.* to which retired full pay of the Artillery is limited, 3596–3598, 3677. After 40 years' service general officers or colonels may retire on 600*l.* a year without limit, 3604. Nobody has taken advantage of this proviso, 3605. These retirements have failed to produce adequate promotion, 3609–3611, 3633. The sum allowed for retirement has not been all taken, 3612, 3613, 3624, 3627. Hands in a return showing since 1858 the number of retirements, 3614. The vote for retirement was increased in 1868–9 by 10,000*l.*, 3615. The retirements are mainly taken immediately on becoming colonels, 3617, 3628, 3630, 3679, 3680. A colonel's full pay position is worth more than 600*l.* a year, 3618–3621. Officers who commute are counted, while they live, as on retired pay, 3625, 3626. The 600*l.* a year after 40 years' service does not come out of the limited 42,400*l.*, 3629.

Royal Artillery: "Five-years' Rule."—"Five-years' rule" does not apply in artillery, 3,666, 3668; does not like it anywhere, 3667, 3669, 3670. An artillery officer on a retired list for a considerable time would lose professional efficiency, 3671. Objects to the "five years' rule" for the Artillery, 3713–3715, 3717–3719; though it would give a flow of promotion, 3716.

Royal Artillery: Measures proposed.—Proposes that the general officers be increased by 12, and then amalgamated with all other arms, so that colonels should be on a general list for promotion by seniority; regimental colonels to retire compulsorily at 58 years of age on 600*l.* a year; lower ranks to have the right to retire on certain annuities after 22 years' service; officers of less than 22 years' service to be entitled to half-pay if disqualified by and in the service; all officers employed extra-regimentally (except lieutenants) to be supernumerary; some offer to be made tending to break up the large blocks of officers of the same service; officers of coast brigade to retire on full pay voluntarily after 30 years' service (12 years at least, commissioned) and compulsorily at 55 years of age, 3633, 3635–3649, 3652, 3654–3665, 3701–3707. If the colonels were all on one list expects the Artillery would get their fair share of appointments as general officer, 3756–3759. Does not think colonels would complain at having to retire at 58 years of age, 3710–3712. Sees no advantage in retirements under 22 years' service, 3672–3674, 3704. For compulsory retirement prefers age to service as a limit, 3653. In preparing a retirement scheme for the whole army knows of nothing particularly distinctive for the Artillery, 3684.

BROWNE, Colonel JAMES F. M., C.B., Deputy-Adjutant General, Royal Engineers.

Royal Engineers: Existing Retirements.—Under Warrant of 1854 officers could retire, if money were available, after 30 years' service: colonels on 600*l.* a year, brevet-colonels on 400*l.* a year, lieutenant-colonels on 1*l.* a day, 3768–3770. Lieutenant-colonels could also have had 1*l.* a day under 30 years' service on a medical board, 3771. The total sum was limited to 16,000*l.* a year, raised by the Warrant of 1872 to 21,500*l.* a year, 3772. Lord Cardwell's Warrant of 1872 limits the 600*l.* to officers of 40 years' service, 3774, subject to vested interests, 3775, which were valued by actuaries, 3776. The 365*l.* on a medical board is gone, but any officer can retire on half-pay after 25 years' service, 3777, 3778; and on the full pay of his rank after 30 years up to the limit of money, 3779. There is no money limit to the 600*l.* pensions after 40 years' service, which are not chargeable to the 21,500*l.* for retired full pay, 3781, 3782. The retirements are not freely taken, 3783, 3784, as they contrast badly with the active emoluments of a colonel (say 1,000*l.* a year), 3785–3787.

Royal Engineers: Present State.—Although the upper ranks are at present young, 3825, 3859; there is stagnation already, 3788, among the subalterns, 3790,

BROWNE, Col.—*continued.*

who are over 13 years' service, 3791, and the prospect is very dark indeed, 3825, 3858. The difficulty is now to deal with the large batches of officers, 3792–3794. In 1871 for such a purpose annuities were given to Artillery officers of from 8 to 22 years' service for a similar purpose, 3795–3801. Such an arrangement might be worked permanently, 3802–3804, though it would cause the loss of many efficient officers, 3805, though some of the less efficient would take it also, 3806–3808. Promotion is by seniority, but employment is by selection, so that good men would have an interest in serving on, 3809–3811. About 14,000*l.* voted for retirement has been unappropriated during the last five years, 3812–3822; probably the whole would have been expended if offered to officers of lower rank, say on the terms proposed by Mr. Childer's Committee, 3823, 3824. There is great equality of age among the officers, 3826. There is five years' difference of service between senior and junior captains, 3827, 3828, seven years in the majors, 3829–3831, and 6½ years in the lieutenant-colonels, 3832–3834. The senior lieutenant has $12\frac{6}{12}$ years' service more than the junior, 3835. For five years the promotions of lieutenants have averaged 13 a year, 3836, 3837, 3835, of captains 10, of majors 9, lieutenant-colonels, 6 a year, 3838, 3839, including the Indian cadres, 3840–3842. Would not desire an amalgamated list of general officers unless it could be fairly divided among the corps concerned, 3843–3847. Has heard no complaint of the supersession which happens among the several cadres of engineers; it is not worth while to rectify it, 3848–3853. The present voluntary system of retirement will be altogether insufficient for a proper flow of promotion, 3860, 3861.

Royal Engineers: Measures proposed.—Would like to offer the seniors 700*l.* a year to retire for a limited time, 3863. Would cancel the pension clauses of the 1872 Warrant, and revert to Warrant of 1854 without limit of money. When the turn for a retired officer would have come to become a general officer, would give him the honorary rank and a general officer's pension to his widow. Would retire lieutenant-colonels on 500*l.* a a year; give permanent pensions to officers medically certified unfit for service, 3864, 3865. Objects to the present commutation table, 3866–3868.

CAMBRIDGE, Field-Marshal His Royal Highness the DUKE OF, K.G., &c., &c.

[Second Examination.]

(*For First Examination, see page* 3.)

General Officers.—Before an establishment of general officers was introduced, seniority as lieutenant-colonel fixed seniority for the remainder of life, 3939, 3940; but there was such inequality in promotion under that system, 3941, that some qualification service precedent to promotion became necessary, 3942. The only remedy against the absorption of our general officers' list by the Indian Staff Corps, is to give the latter an entirely separate establishment, 3875, 3876, 3879, 3881, 3884; when some amount of supersession must be expected, 3877, 3878. The great bulk of British officers have a right to look forward to promotion into an establishment of 275 general officers, 3880. The necessity for a change is very pressing, as the British are now taking Staff Corps vacancies, 3882. Fears that the ante-dating of commissions as major-general so that both establishments, should rank after promotion as they did when colonels, would lead to confusion, 3885–3888, 3893, 3894. Indian Staff Corps general officers could be ante-dated if it were found to be necessary, 3935–3938. If a rule that after so many years unemployed a general officer should *ipso facto* be retired could be carried out with justice it would be very desirable, 3934.

CAMBRIDGE, DUKE OF.—*continued.*

Colonels.—A colonel going to half-pay and remaining unemployed three or four years becomes too rusty to be of further service; therefore, if the "five years' rule" is to be maintained some retirement for colonels is indispensable, 3897, 3898, 3931, 3932; compulsory retirement is to be avoided if possible; but it will be very difficult to avoid it, 3899. A good service pension already held may be retained with retired pay, but one should not be awarded to a man already retired, 3900–3902. A general officer should be promoted straight up from a regiment, or within a year or two of leaving it, 3928; the "five years' rule" (which witness disapproves) is a great obstacle, 3929. To limit promotion to major-general to colonels who have been employed within a given number of years would be a great advantage, but very difficult, 3927, 3928. The probability of a distinguished officer being left long on half-pay must depend on the opportunities for employing him, 3933.

Lieutenant-Colonels.—The rank of lieutenant-colonel carries more responsibility and importance than any inferior rank, 3924.

Majors.—Putting majors on half-pay after five years is a "most terrible prospect," 3929, the only alternative is to give them sums of money to retire, 3930.

Foot Guards.—The guards will be organized exactly as the line; the only point not yet settled is that of majors, 3903, 3912.

Supersession.—Supersession is more serious in the upper than in the lower grades, 3892. Supersession from accidents of service between different regiments of the same arm would be accepted without demur; but disparity of promotion in different arms would be a ground of complaint, 3889–3891. The supersession between artillery and engineers and the line is not in itself a great matter, 3925, 3926.

Seconding.—Does not think engineer officers who take purely civil appointments should qualify for promotion, 3913–3917, but opportunity for holding non-combatant appointments (while seconded) should be given to all arms, 3918–3920, the period being fixed when the officer must elect to return to military duty or to quit it altogether, 3921, 3923. For the commissariat, officers should be transferred altogether, 3922, or for the pay department, 3923.

Purchase System.—No such case as a madman and an idiot being retained in a regiment and promoted could have happened since witness has commanded in chief, nor earlier, to his idea, though the removal of a rather incompetent man was difficult under purchase, 3872–3874.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

ARMY PROMOTION.

War Office, Pall Mall, Friday, 9th April 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

His Royal Highness Field Marshal the DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, K.G. examined.

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge K.G.

9 April 1875.

1. (*Chairman.*) The Commission wish to have the benefit of your Royal Highness's great experience and advice upon many questions that have occurred to our minds. The abolition of purchase has produced the necessity for some system of retirement which should take its place, and various questions besides those that are immediately connected with money considerations arise as to what that system of retirement should be. Am I correct in saying that the Queen's warrant abolishing purchase and the subsequent Act of Parliament which was based upon it have practically left promotion as a pure matter of selection as far as the rights or interests of the individual officers are concerned?—Yes; that is so.

2. At present either the Secretary of State for War or the Commander-in-Chief has the power on the occurrence of any vacancy of filling it up in any way he may think proper?—The Commander-in-Chief has that power.

3. But I presume that that power, although it resides in the military authorities practically, is not exercised to the extent of doing away with seniority in regimental appointments?—No; practically it is regimental promotion, but with rejection or with selection whenever it is found advisable not to promote the regimental senior officer.

4. At present, dealing with the matter as a practical one, when a vacancy occurs the next regimental officer would have the vacancy unless there were substantial objections to his having it?—That is the way in which it has been done by me since that power has been given to me; but of course, supposing I were to be succeeded by anybody who took a different view, it is quite within his competency to have nothing but selection if he thought fit, at least that is the way in which I read the warrant, and the present arrangement.

5. In your opinion is the system of regimental seniority, tempered and varied under peculiar circumstances by selection, the best system?—I think it is the best system that we can adopt at present, and I think it is a fair system, provided, as I view it, that it is carried out as much regimentally as it is practicable to do so, because I consider that the regimental sentiment and feeling is really the backbone of all our army arrangements.

6. Then I gather from your last answer that your opinion would not only be that seniority as the rule would be a desirable thing, but that that seniority should be seniority in the regiment, and not seniority in the army?—Most decidedly in the regiment.

7. Do you think that a change to a system of promotion based upon seniority in the army would be likely to break up the regimental system or the valuable portions of it?—I think it would simply destroy it.

8. I think you have already said that where sufficient reasons existed the rule of seniority ought not to be rigidly followed?—Certainly.

9. What means at present have the military authorities for exercising that discretion?—We have the confidential reports, which now come in regularly, of every officer; not the ordinary old ones, which were merely in very general terms, but regular distinct reports upon the character and conduct of every officer in every regiment in the service, which we have now in our books; and therefore, whenever we want to know the particular merits or demerits of any officer that could be named, we turn to the confidential reports on that officer, and we are there able to discover whether he is well thought of or not, or whether his specialities are favourable to him or the reverse.

10. Those confidential reports are annual, are they not?—They are made annually for each regiment, and made by the commanding officer, and they are endorsed by the inspecting officer, although the latter is a difficult matter, because it very often happens that the regiment is not immediately under the eye of the general officer, the inspecting officer; still that is the only security we have that the commanding officer does not make a statement which afterwards perhaps he would not be quite able to bear out.

11. Does that work itself out as a tolerable sufficient security?—I hope it will in time; it takes time to establish it. I do not think it has been quite understood hitherto. I do not think that the great import-

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

ance of it has been quite appreciated by general officers, but I have no doubt that they are beginning now to see that it is a very essential element in the proper mode of dealing with promotion in the army, and whenever that is thoroughly understood I see no reason why it should not answer. But then there is always this to be said, and that is the great difficulty of selection, that each individual officer looks upon cases in a different point of view. One man is extremely lenient, and another man is extremely the reverse; one man is very susceptible, perhaps as a commanding officer, of any little slight, and of course that all comes out in the confidential views which he gives of the character of the officers. The difficulty that we have is to steer clear of any injustice, and therefore, even when we have reports against an officer, I should never take them without making further inquiries as to whether they are really borne out by instances and circumstances which could be detailed to me as regards default. With regard to merit, of course I am very happy to take the report, and therefore I do not think that there is the same danger in the case of merit as of demerit. With demerit I should always be extremely cautious.

12. I understand that before you would act upon a report which was prejudicial to an officer's advancement, you would seek some extraneous evidence to satisfy yourself that the report was well founded?—Yes. If I was well satisfied myself with the general officer's report, which was in the same sense as the commanding officer's, I should not hesitate for a moment to act upon the joint report, but if it was merely the commanding officer's report, and the general officer said that he could not give a decided opinion as to a man's character as given by the commanding officer, I should certainly, before I acted to the detriment of an officer, take some measures to ascertain the facts of the case.

13. How long has this system been in operation of which you have just been speaking?—Only since the change upon the abolition of purchase.

14. Are those annual reports which concern the capacities and so on of the different officers to whom they refer, posted up and kept in the department?—They are all posted up and kept in volumes in a continuous history. We have improved the system very much of late. Of course, when we first introduced it we did not exactly know what was necessary and what was not, and we have made a good many modifications since we commenced it, and no doubt we should continue to do so if we found it necessary. But there is one thing now introduced to which I think the general commanding or the inspecting officer rather object, but which I think is essential, and that is this:—It is now ordered that the officer who inspects is to have those answers explained or filled in, or at all events, explained in the Commanding Officer's presence, at the inspection, so that the inspecting officer has an opportunity to judge as far as he can of the ground upon which such statements are made. That I understand some general officers object to, but I think it is extremely important because of course you have the chance of seeing whether there is any favour or affection in anything that is stated, or whether it is *bonâ fide* the actual case as regards the incidents which have occurred.

15. With the experience which you have had, which has not been very long, of this system, would you be inclined to say that that system appears to be tolerably satisfactory?—I think it is satisfactory, but at the same time I must say that the army as a body do not like what are called confidential reports, because they always consider that there is something secret in them. My view is that nothing should be said against an officer without his being informed of it, and, as far as I am able to secure it, we have that information always given, but it is not always possible that we can be satisfied that the officer knows that there has been something stated against him. In grave cases he always knows it, but in perhaps less grave cases, in mere matters of opinion, it might be that he did not know that there had been any thing said against him, and the feeling in the army to that extent is that they do not like it.

16. I understand it to be your opinion that in all cases where something is reported to the detriment of an officer, he should be informed of it, and not that practically in all cases he is now so informed?—That he should be so informed. It ought to be made a *sine quâ non* that he is informed.

17. But that is not the universal practice now?—We inculcate it as much as we can; but I do not believe that it is altogether carried out to the extent that I should like, at least I am under that impression. I may be wrong of course.

18. Do you think that an officer should become acquainted with the Report at the time it is made, and not when it comes to a question of his promotion?—I think he should know of it when it is made against him. I quite agree that that is very important, because as I have already stated I myself when any officer has to be passed over, inform him of course beforehand that such is my intention, but I think that the commanding officer, who makes a statement against an officer, ought in justice and in reason to say to that officer, I consider it my duty to report that you are unfavourably thought of by me on such and such points.

19. Might not that be made imperative on the commanding officer?—There is no question that it might be, and I think it ought to be done. If I might just go on with this point, the difficulty is very obvious that of course it produces, or is likely to produce, an unpleasant feeling, and an inharmonious feeling between an individual officer in a regiment and the commanding officer. There are many commanding officers to whom it would be very distasteful to do so, although they might consider it their duty to make statements against an officer.

20. That difficulty is one which occurs naturally, and no doubt is a difficulty producing a certain amount of ill, but upon the balance of advantage and disadvantage, are you of opinion or not that the system is desirable?—It is most essential, I think.

21. To follow up the case of a supposed officer, against whom an unfavorable report should have been made, when the time comes for acting upon it, and he stands next in seniority for promotion, what is the course which would be taken by your Royal Highness?—He would be informed that certain reports were standing against him, and that he was passed over upon those grounds, but the chances are that he would know this beforehand. The probable course would be that he would be informed that unless such statements as had been made against him were withdrawn, or that a more favourable report could be made of him, when the period came for his promotion he would not be promoted.

22. Then comes this further question; in the case of such a person, is it desirable or not that, if passed over, he should remain in the regiment?—Most decidedly he ought to be made to retire. A case has occurred only within the last few days where an officer has been passed over, and where I am strongly of opinion that he ought to be called upon to retire.

23. In what rank was that?—Lieutenant.

24. In the case to which your Royal Highness alludes, was it for unfitness for promotion, or inefficiency or misconduct?—It was for conduct which, I think, rendered the officer unsuitable for promotion, and therefore it was in my opinion undesirable that he should be promoted.

25. It is obvious, is it not, that there are many men about whom it might be said that it was undesirable that they should be promoted, but not about whom it could be said that it was altogether undesirable that they should remain in the army?—I think in this case to which I refer it would be undesirable that he should remain in the army.

26. I want to know whether the fact of a man being unfit to take the next step when his turn for promotion comes would in itself render it desirable that he should be called upon to retire. Take, for instance

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875

the case of the senior captain of a regiment. Supposing he is unfit to become a field officer, would the very fact of his unfitness for promotion render it undesirable thathe should remain in the regiment as captain ?—Most undesirable ; because, according to seniority, he would be very likely to fall into the very position which you have decided as unsuitable to put him into.

27. It might fall to him by seniority to be made a field officer ?—Yes. For instance, supposing a captain through incapacity is not promoted to be a major, and either at home or on service in the field his senior officer is removed by illness or is killed, he falls into the command, he would be the very man who has not been promoted to be major as being unfit, and surely that officer ought not to be allowed to remain in a position where he could succeed to a command for which his unsuitableness had been made notorious to the whole army.

28. Then you would say that, having arrived at the conclusion that a man was unfit to be promoted, for that very reason he ought to be informed of it and induced to leave the army ?—Yes, I think so ; and I should like to add to that last answer, that that is why I think that selection is such a very delicate process, and one requiring an immense deal of tact in administering, because, if I am right in the view I take that a man so circumstanced ought to be removed from the service, you virtually by the act of not promoting him, destroy his whole career.

29. Still the observations which you have made upon the subject at present go rather to rejection than to pure selection ?—Yes, decidedly.

30. It is a negative rather than an affirmative opinion ?—Yes, certainly.

31. I wish to ask your Royal Highness whether you think that the power of rejection based upon those reports of individuals for promotion is an efficient method of securing promotion in the army to the best man ?—I really think so.

32. You would not be disposed to go further and establish any system which quite independent of demerit should give promotion to marked merit ?—I think that would be open to very grave objection, because you might, whilst intending to do the right thing, do injustice to officers who really are just as well worthy of consideration as the officers that you select ; I should be very indisposed to go beyond what I have stated already.

33. There are, I believe, about 6,000 officers in the army ?—About 6,000.

34. If a general system of promotion by merit were instituted it would devolve upon the Commander-in-Chief to investigate the merits of those 6,000 upon those confidential reports and endeavour to strike a balance of their respective merits for promotion, would that be practicable ?—It would be perfectly impossible.

35. You do not think it possible to deal efficiently with what may be called comparative merit as ascertained from the reports of commanding officers ?—No ; because our service is so varied. Supposing it were like the German army, where the whole service is at home, you might have much more facilities for doing that than you could with our army, who are scattered all over the world. Whereas one man may be engaged in beneficial and acceptable service in the field in India or elsewhere, another may be serving in a bad climate in the West Indies, and yet the merits of the latter may be just as great as those of the man who is serving very agreeably to himself in the field, and if you give all the profit and all the advantage to the field service and to favourably circumstanced corps, those unfortunate men who are in other parts of the world and have not the same advantage would be entirely left in the background, and would have no chance of coming up again to the front during the whole period of their service in the army.

36. Active service is a means, is it not, of disclosing merit ?—Yes. During the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny there were certain regiments that had not the advantage of being in either of them, and the career of the officers of those regiments would be completely destroyed if you only looked to those who were serving in the field, whereas those who were doing garrison duty, which is just as much a necessity in war as in peace, would really suffer to such an extent that you could not maintain the army on a just footing.

37. You mean that they would suffer by not having an opportunity of disclosing the merit which they possess in common with others ?—Just so. Our service is so very varied and so very peculiar. We have so many various incidents of service to deal with that even if you could work out such a system in any other army I am sure you could not do so with ours.

38. Of course I understand your Royal Highness' answer not to apply to any particular case in which a man who had shown great merit should be thought worthy of selection, but to the system ?—Exactly so. There will always be cases in an army such as ours like the one which you refer to, and by which the service derives great benefit ; but you would caus great injustice if you made that the rule upon which you proposed to act ; one set of men by accident would get the whole benefit, and others who perhaps were quite as good men would not have a chance.

39. I think I understand you to say that you have no doubt upon the proposition that to whatever extent seniority determines the position, it should be seniority in the regiment and not in the army ?—Yes, it should certainly be seniority in the regiment. When you come to selection then you would take seniority in the army. In cases of selecting officers to become captains we certainly have generally taken the senior lieutenants in other regiments, but seniority in the regiment I think is the right course.

40. That is to say, where promotion goes by seniority, the seniority to be regarded should be the seniority in the regiment ?—Exactly so.

41. Would that in your opinion extend up to lieutenant-colonels ?—I think so. I think that you would be more particular in the selection of a lieutenant-colonel than you would in the case of a captain ; but at the same time, whenever you can select the major to be lieutenant-colonel of the regiment I should prefer it.

42. You would take the major of a regiment to fill the vacant step of lieutenant-colonel in his regiment unless there were some strong reason to the contrary ?—Yes, certainly.

43. You would follow out therefore the system of seniority through the regiment ?—Yes, through the regiment.

44. It has been observed, and no doubt it is true, that the effect of giving promotion according to seniority in the regiment is to make the advance of men in some regiments through good luck much more rapid than of those in other regiments ; is that, do you think, an evil of any importance ?—No, I do not think it is. The moment a man knows that it is through no fault of his that is position is retarded, I do not think it signifies at all. I think that is perfectly understood.

45. You think that the officers, as a body, are well satisfied with that which is the mere result of chance or good luck, although the good luck does not descend upon themselves ?—Yes. In the one case it is accident, in the other it is supposed to be demerit. Where it is demerit they object, but where it is accident they do not.

46. I suppose there is no doubt that to whatever extent seniority can be adhered to it is the most popular system in the army ?—Yes ; there is no question of that, except in the cases of individuals. Of course you will always have individuals who think that there is something about them that may bring them more prominently forward, and who would object because they would think that they would get on quicker by being selected ; but the great bulk of the

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

officers of the army I have no doubt would prefer seniority.

47. To what extent have those confidential reports within the limited period during which they have existed led to rejection; have there been many instances?—No; I do not think there have been many. There have been some, but not a great many.

48. With the view of equalising that which now exists to a great extent, or would exist under the system of promotion by regimental seniority, it has been suggested that it might be made a rule that no man should rise, say from the rank of lieutenant to captain, until he had had a certain number of years' service, so that if a regiment was lucky in vacancies and a very young man was coming forward to take the grade of captain, this rule would stand in his way, and some one would be brought in from another regiment, and in that way the flow of promotion would be more equalised throughout the army; do you think that anything of that sort would be satisfactory?—We have done that a good deal in the cavalry. The cavalry have had much more quick promotion than the infantry, and there have been several occasions where the senior lieutenants have been very young officers, and there have been other officers of older standing, lieutenants in other corps, and in these cases I have generally passed those younger officers over once, but I have never stopped the flow of promotion. Probably the next step would be given to a younger officer, and if the next was young again, I might probably bring in another; but beyond that I would not lay down any hard and fast line, but leave it to the authorities.

49. I understand you that that is the system which is practically acted upon when vacancies have occurred, where the promotion would be out of all proportion to the merit?—Yes; but that has only been done of course since the new system; it was not done in the olden time.

50. It could not have been done in the olden time without interfering with the rights of the officers?—Just so.

51. But under the new system there is abundant power to deal with that difficulty, and as I understand you it has been so dealt with?—There is ample power, and it has been exercised in the cavalry on a good many occasions.

52. But you would deprecate any positive rule of that sort?—Yes; I would deprecate any positive rule. I think that it had better be left to the discretion of the authorities.

53. With regard to promotion by merit, quite independent of those reports that we have been discussing, it is an obvious reflection upon the abolition of purchase that the great benefit which the public was to obtain by the expenditure of a very large sum of money was the power of selecting officers by merit, and disregarding the claims, so to speak, of mere seniority. That was one great benefit, if not the great benefit to be obtained by that great change, and it has been suggested that some method might be adopted which would by a self-acting process push forward young men who had shown themselves to be desirous of making the army their profession and had shown themselves to be men of capacity and ability, and amongst other things it has been suggested that if they liked to go to the Staff College and pass the Staff College, or with regard to the Indian army, if they should pass in the Indian languages, or if they should serve as adjutant, and some other things that have been thrown out as tests of merit, in those cases a sort of artificial addition should be made to their actual years of service which would give them a practical seniority in their regiment; do you think that any system of that kind would be an available one?—I think that that would be very objectionable.

54. Would you have the goodness to state what objections you see to that proposition?—I am not at all sure that the officers who pass the Staff College are the best officers to be promoted. I should prefer taking the best regimental officers that I could pick out, but I should certainly give the officers you have suggested no special advantges. They get already great advantages by going to the Staff College, because they get staff appointments, and we make it a rule always to give all the junior staff appointments, to officers who have passed the college. As to the rest, I do not think it follows that because an officer passes in Hindustani, for instance, he is a good officer. There are many officers who are great book-worms, but who, I think, are very moderate officers. I prefer a man who has led his company or his squadron well, and who I know from the commanding officer is a man to be relied upon at an outposts. I think he is very preferable to a man who happens to know a number of languages, or has devoted himself to some special study.

55. No doubt mere literary acquirements of any sort form but one qualification for a good officer?—I do not object to them at all, but still I do not think you ought to rely on them solely; I do not think you ought to give undue preponderance to them over really military acquirements.

56. It is a fact, is it not, that amongst the younger officers in a regiment a good man, not looking at him merely as a man who can pass an examination, but a man who possesses other intrinsic qualities, namely, decision, promptitude, good sense, tact, and energy, and so forth, and who is likely to make a good officer, is well known amongst his fellows, generally speaking?—Yes. You would always be able to pick out the best man in a regiment from the feeling of the regiment. I would myself infinitely prefer to pick out the best man by regimental intuition than by any test examination.

57. Is there any means of getting at that regimental intuition?—I am satisfied that if I were to ask the commanding officers to recommend me the best man for the staff, I should get the best man.

58. Is that a system which is acted upon now?—No, I am sorry to say that it is not.

59. Is there any means of bringing it about?—Of course there would be no difficulty about it if it was so ordered, but the principle now is that they must go to the Staff College for staff employment, and therefore we cannot depart from that principle, and we do not depart from it at all, except in the case of proved merit in the field, and that is the difficulty, because there is a great deal of jealousy on the part of the officers who pass through the Staff College. Unless we can bring forward proved merit in the field, which nobody can contravene, we should be very much blamed if we preferred men of that sort to men who had been at the Staff College.

60. Then the present rule is that you must take men who have passed through the Staff College?—Yes, all the junior appointments on the staff come entirely from the Staff College. I have not carried it out to the full extent in the upper grades hitherto, the officers not having been of the rank to justify it; besides which I prefer to have the power of putting my own hand on a man who I am satisfied would make a good staff officer in preference to merely looking to those men who have passed the college examination.

61. What I was desiring to inquire into was the rate of regimental promotion, and whether the fact that a young man had shown himself to those in the regiment and satisfied them by what you term the regimental intuition, that he was a man who was likely to make a good officer, could be laid hold of in any way to insure his more rapid promotion?—No doubt it might be arrived at, but it is very difficult of course, because how would you put comparative merit as between regiments. You might say, this is the best officer in a particular regiment; but how are you to say that the 61st regiment is better officered than the 62nd or the 63rd. Therefore, when it comes to the Commander-in-Chief having the selection, it would be a very difficult matter to know upon what ground he is to make his selection.

62. But confining my question to within a regi-

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge. K.G.

9 April 1875.

ment, would you have any means of passing one man over another?—I would never pass one man over another. If by selection you promote men in the same regiment you will destroy the regiment entirely—you could only promote out of the regiment. For instance, in the late Ashantee war there were a great many lieutenants who went to Ashantee, and whenever you can you would give them a pull, if they have been well thought of; by promoting them on occasions when there is some reason why you do not want to give promotion in the regiment, you would then select such officers. There have been instances of that sort, but that promotion was for service in the field, and not merely for success in examination.

63. Could such a system be carried out through the medium of unattached promotion?—As far as unattached promotion is concerned, the difficulty would be to get an officer who was once promoted to unattached rank back into the service, because of course when promotion goes in a regiment all the officers expect to have the benefit of the promotion unless there is some default. And thus there is the difficulty of bringing men back from half pay. If you could bring them back from half pay we could give them unattached promotion, but the difficulty is to find the means of doing so.

64. The system to which I am alluding is that of giving men unattached promotion with the understanding that they should be brought back from half pay upon vacancies occurring?—But to take the case of officers in the Crimean war, it was at one time the rule and it was in the warrant that a man who got brevet rank in the field had a right to claim its being converted into what is called substantive rank; that gave him positive rank in the army, but some majors who then took substantive rank have never been brought back to this day and I fear never can be. I do not doubt that they thought they were doing themselves a good turn in taking substantive rank, but we really have never had an opportunity of bringing them back, and we have lost good men by it, and they have been discontented and unhappy. It would be just the same now, I fear, because if I am right in the assumption that as a rule you ought to have regimental promotion with rejection, very few indeed would be brought back from the unattached list. But you could promote a few men annually. For instance, upon three death vacancies, we give unattached promotion, and we bring those men back again as soon as we can; but if this were done more largely, which I understand to be the idea from the way the question has been put to me, I am afraid that we sohuld have much difficulty in bringing them back, and that we should do them more harm than good by such unattached promotion.

65. What I intended to ask was this, whether it would be a desirable system not only to give them unattached promotion but that as part of the system there should be a power to bring them back (that power being now implied wherever there is a power of selection) from half pay on to full pay on a vacancy occurring; no doubt that would stop regimental promotion *pro tanto* on every occasion when it was exercised, and would to that extent break in upon the new system of regimental seniority?—Yes, you would give cause for discontent to the whole body of officers in the regiment, and you would content one man by making discontented eight or ten at the very least.

66. But you would get a good man thereby, would you not?—You would very much trench upon the regimental system which I think is so very important. My own wish is to see every officer stick to his regiment as much as possible throughout his service, and to be promoted out of it on attaining the general officer's rank. The best regiments are those where the officers remain in them. We always find that in all good regiments the officers never will leave unless there is some special ground for their doing so, perhaps some service upon which their health breaks down, and so on; but otherwise, as a rule, you will see that in good regiments the officers stay, whereas in moderate regiments they will go.

67. It would be unpopular, of course, in a regiment if some one was brought in from outside to fill a vacant captaincy?—It would be very distasteful as a rule.

68. But it would be a method of securing the services of men who had shewn themselves of merit?—Perhaps so, but I think in the general run men are much of a muchness. I find that officers of the army are very much on a par. I am quite ready to take them for better or for worse to a great extent, except in very special cases.

69. Your Royal Highness's conclusion, as I understand it, would be this, that so far as merit is concerned, the most that you can efficiently do, is to act upon the principle of rejection when there is a want of capacity?—Just so.

70. And that for the rest in a regiment you must be content to take the run of officers that come forward by regimental seniority?—I think so. I think that you have a very great advantage now over what you had in former days, when it was a matter of course that a man was promoted unless he misconducted himself. Supposing a man was idle and so on, there was no particular reason why you should not allow a man to be promoted by purchase, but now, when you have the power of saying to a man, you are not to be promoted if you do not show yourself zealous and so on, you have very great power over a man to keep him up to the mark, and if he does not keep himself up to the mark, you say to him, you will not be promoted. So that I think, that with the power existing now, there is very great inducement to any body who is at all slack or disposed to be slack to exert himself so as to entitle him to promotion on a vacancy occurring.

71. Is that power exercised now in that way?—It would be most assuredly. If any officer was indolent or inefficient, or showed no zeal, I should have no hesitation in letting him know that unless he showed more zeal, I would not promote him, and that another man would be put over his head either from another regiment or by supersession in his own regiment. A case of that sort has happened recently, where I put a man over the head of another in the regiment, because I considered it very hard that a regiment should suffer because the senior officer of a certain rank happened to be indolent or inefficient in any way, and therefore all his juniors should suffer by his default.

72. In those annual reports which you have, you think that there are the means of the authorities becoming sufficiently acquainted with any want of energy or want of ability on the part of officers, so as to enable you to give them a suggestion that if they do not alter their course and take more interest and more zeal in the service, you will stop their promotion?—Certainly.

73. And that is the way in which the system is worked now?—That is the way in which it is attempted to be worked, and the direction in which I think, when it gets into working order, it will be found to work more and more satisfactorily every year, and to that extent I think it is a great advantage.

74. The confidential reports, as I understand you, are capable by-and-bye as the system goes on of being elaborated into a more efficient shape than they at present assume?—I think so. It is a new system, and of course we have already found that there are certain arrangements which were not at first contemplated, and there are improvements which have been introduced, and if we found that it would be necessary to introduce other improvements we should certainly do so at once. I have no fear of it myself, always, of course, with the reservation of the difficulty that there is in various individual minds looking at efficiency in an officer in the same subject, but I think we shall really get at a sound system.

75. Of course, all reports from commanding officers must at times be liable to be tainted with prejudice as between one individual and another?—Yes, that is a danger, and that is what we are called upon to guard against as far as possible. I should like to see general

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

officer take a good deal of responsibility upon them in this respect; of course, the highest authority always maintaining his position by deciding what is fair, but if general officers in making their inspection were to look carefully into the circumstances of each officer it would be an enormous assistance, to say the least, to the Commander in Chief, and it is the only way, in my opinion, in which this system could be carried out at all without injustice to individuals, and also with advantage to the public service.

76. In order to make the system thoroughly efficient, you want the active control of the general officers as a check?—Yes, and that the general officers should have the courage to state what they really complain of, which is, of course, a very delicate thing, and also a very difficult thing for them, because they may not themselves be brought much in contact with the officers, and therefore their individual views must be very much guided by the views of the commanding officer or whoever it is who has to deal with the individual who is under consideration. It must be for the general officers to find out the best means of ascertaing whether those statements are fully born out by the facts of the case, and then if he makes a statement upon it to the highest authority, the highest authority is in no difficulty in dealing with the case, because he knows that it is fairly put before him and without prejudice or reservation. But it must depend very much upon the general officer, because I candidly say that the mere individual commanding officer, however much I may rely upon him, is very often placed in a very difficult position as regards officers with whom he is in daily contact. Commanding officers may take a prejudice really unintentionally against a man, not wishing to do him any injustice, but because they think there is something against him, when perhaps in reality what is against him is very much less important than they may consider it to be. As I say, it depends so much upon the individual. In some regiments a case is taken up with great alacrity against a man, whereas in another regiment the same thing would be passed over and nobody would think anything of it; it entirely depends upon the general system and tone of the regiment, for there is a great deal in the tone of a regiment.

77. There are difficulties and evils inseparable, no doubt, from the system of reports?—Yes, and that is why I dwell so much upon the general officer or the inspecting officer having a great share in any statement that goes up to the higher authorities upon the individual officers of a regiment.

78. I gather from your Royal Highness's views, as hitherto expressed, that you see no distinction between the different ranks as to the proper mode of filling up vacancies, but that you would apply one system throughout to all ranks up to and including lieutenant-colonels, namely, that of regimental seniority subject to rejection?—Certainly.

79. And subject in certain cases, I suppose, to selection?—Yes, I suppose it would be subject to selection. I said rejection, but of course where one man was disqualified and I selected another man, it would be selection.

80. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Did I rightly infer from what your Royal Highness stated in the former part of your evidence that in former days there was no limit of service preventing a man from promotion if he was too young?—No, there was a limit. I think in the case of a major it was two years' service in that rank, and in the case of a captain three years' service. I would not recommend any further limit than there is at present.

81. (*Chairman.*) As regards the staff, on what principle at present are appointments to the staff made?—In the junior grade of the service entirely from the Staff College. All the officers that pass through the Staff College I consider, unless there is something against them, which is hardly ever the case, have a claim to consideration in their turn, and to be put upon the staff, and we have done so invariably. In the higher grades it is entirely by selection of my own in conjunction with the other officers of my staff, but I hold myself responsible.

82. With regard to the question of what is the most desirable system in respect of staff appointments, there is no doubt that if there is an officer who has filled with distinction a staff appointment, he has obtained a certain amount of valuable experience and has become more qualified perhaps than another individual who has not had that experience or exercised those functions, but on the other hand there is no doubt that the result of following a practice based upon that view would be to exclude a vast number of men in the army from enjoying those appointments which are objects of ambition to all. What is your Royal Highness's opinion upon that subject?—I think that the five years' rule is a very good rule, but I think that the authorities ought to have very large powers of re-appointment if they think it essential for the public service. I think that the five years' rule ought to be maintained in staff appointments, but I think that the military authorities ought to have very large powers given to them to re-appoint men who have shown themselves very capable of staff appointments.

83. But they have unlimited power, have they not, now?—Yes, they have, but I think that it ought to be exercised whenever they think it right and proper.

84. To what extent do you think it is desirable to re-appoint some individuals to the exclusion of other individuals in the army, who perhaps may not have had the same opportunity of distinguishing themselves?—I think as a rule I would not do so, but if that was the rule, the first thing that I would look to on emergencies would be for men who had been on the staff, and I would select them at once, without any hesitation, whether they had had a staff appointment lately or not. On the contrary I should prefer them, and I have no doubt that the feeling of the army would be in favour of such a course. In ordinary times of peace I think that a staff appointment of five years is a good rule, and one which is to the advantage of the juniors, but I should never allow it to prevent me re-appointing a man who really showed very great merit in preference even to a man who had not been on the staff.

85. Your late answers apply to staff appointments, and not to the command of regiments?—To staff appointments entirely.

86. Then your view would be that the rule should be after five years to appoint a new hand?—Yes, certainly, I think so as a rule.

87. But subject to such exceptions as you might consider desirable?—Just so.

88. In the event of active service or any sudden emergency or pressure, probably you would have recourse in a great measure to re-appointments?—Then I would not consider whether a man had held a staff appointment at a former time or not. I would take the man who in my mind would be most likely to prove himself an efficient staff officer.

89. With regard to brevets, the system of brevet rank has been, if I may say so, somewhat abused, has it not?—There has been a great deal of brevet promotion given at times.

90. Too much of it, do not you think?—Perhaps so, but it is very difficult to curtail it at times.

91. Is the system of brevet one that is essential to the service?—I wish I could say that it was not, but I do not see how we are to get out of it. Some have thought, and I think myself, that in many cases if you had a larger power of giving good service rewards, no doubt that would take the place of brevet in some respects, say 100*l.* a year additional pay, or 50*l.* additional pay to a captain, and so on; that would to a certain extent take the place of brevet, but that would not give the man the pull that he has in army rank, because of course the advantage in army rank is very great. Take the case of an officer who has recently distinguished himself very much. He had very good luck, and he knew how to avail himself of it, but he was only a substantive major when he was

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

promoted to general officer, and if he had not had the army rank that he had by brevet, he never would have been where he is at this moment. Therefore, if you do away with brevet, I do not think that a good many men could ever come to the front at all.

92. I understand your opinion to be that brevet is a means of getting deserving officers forward into a position in the army which enables the state to employ them in high commands?—That is exactly what I mean, and I think it much less objectionable than the selection of men for a higher substantive rank, which I think would be very hurtful to many officers, whereas this system does not injure the officers at all, and yet puts such a man forward. I do not think that giving a good service pension, which has been suggested, could in any way effect the advantage which a man gains by brevet in the mode which I have described.

93. Any replacement of the system of brevet by a good service pension would be addressed merely to the benefit and reward of the individual, whereas the brevet system, as I understand, would be beneficial to the State as well as to the individual, by giving the State an opportunity of availing itself of the services of an officer who was so young in standing as to occupy but an inferior grade in the regiment?—Most assuredly.

94. Would not this same result be gained by a man getting un-attached promotion?—No, because you could not bring him back again to full pay if you gave him unattached promotion. You would have to bring him back again to full pay, and the difficulty of doing so is really very great.

95. A man who receives brevet rank remains on full pay, does he not?—Yes, whereas unattached promotion removes from full pay.

96. And consequently he is taken away from active service?—Yes.

97. That is the benefit of brevet, but on the other hand is it not somewhat of an evil in the brevet system that a man who is, we will say, a captain in his regiment, should be serving as a captain, although he may be a brevet colonel?—That is a disadvantage, no doubt, and I have known very great disadvantages where a major has been a full colonel by brevet, and the lieutenant-colonel of the regiment has only been a lieutenant-colonel, and therefore when he came into a station where there were other troops besides his own regiment, the major would take the command at the station, although his own lieutenant-colonel was in actual command of the regiment, but even with all that disadvantage, which I think is very great, I do not see how you can replace brevet in such a way as to retain the advantages which brevet does certainly confer.

98. Upon the balance of advantage and disadvantage you would retain brevet?—Yes, upon the balance I would. I am afraid I must say that I do not see any alternative, but if I could find an alternative, I certainly should be very glad of it.

99. Is this a thing which often occurs (and in fact it must be so, to whatever extent brevet is given), that a man in an inferior grade in a regiment may have a superior grade to the man who is commanding the regiment?—That very frequently happens. There are several captains that were made lieutenant-colonels in the late Ashantee war, and although as captains they do not qualify for colonels, still they get into a higher position, which has its disadvantages, no doubt.

100. And it has its anomalies?—Yes.

101. Is there any means that occurs to you of limiting brevet, or any suggestion that you could make upon that subject?—It is really the only reward that you have to give a man unless you give him the Order of the Bath, which is given only to a very small number, and which is never given except in the higher grades. In the case of most of the grades of officers of the army, when they are on service, it is the only thing that you can do for them.

102. Might not a mixed system answer the purpose; might not you retain the brevet system with the view of pushing forward those men who are fit for ulterior command, and at the same time inaugurate some system of advanced pay?—I think it would be very well worth considering, and I think it would be very desirable to try if it could be done.

103. I mean a system which would minimise the evils of brevet whilst retaining the distinct benefits of it?—Yes; I think it would be very desirable.

104. With reference to the present system of entrance into the army through a competitive examination, are you able to give the Commission any information as to the class of men who have come forward to join the army since the new system came into operation, as contrasted with the class that used to enter the army before?—It is very early days for me to give an opinion upon it, but I am myself under the impression that there is not much change. If there is any at all, perhaps it is that it has excluded some men whom otherwise we should be glad to see in the army; but as I say, it is very early days to give any decided opinion upon it.

105. You think that there is hardly enough material at present to form an opinion upon?—I think not.

106. Is the system of competitive examination for the army one that you think desirable?—I think it most objectionable. I think the only good system is a qualifying examination. You may put the qualifying examination as high as you like, you may make it higher than the competitive even if you like; but by competitive examination I believe you lose some of the very best officers that you could possibly have in the army. It is quite a mistake to suppose that because you are to have a qualifying examination it is not to be a high one, because it entirely rests with the authorities to decide how high it should be; but the moment you make it competitive of course you exclude a very large number of men who have not had the same advantages of instruction as some of their neighbours.

107. Under the competitive system you give a commission to the man who has the highest intellectual acquirements?—Yes, but that is all; and no other considerations are taken into account.

108. And is intellectual acquirement by any means the only quality that you want in an officer?—No; by no means. I am all for examination, but I am all for a qualifying examination which, according to the circumstances of the day, you can put as high or as low as you like, but the moment you make it competitive of course you are obliged rigidly to adhere to the results of that system.

109. That is to say, as I understand you, you are for insisting upon a certain amount of intellectual acquirement and acquire knowledge as a *sine quâ non*?—Yes, most assuredly.

110. But you do not think that a competitive examination tends to give you the best men?—No, I do not, indeed. I think that it gives you a great many men whose actual scientific acquirements would be higher than you would get if it was only a qualifying examination, but I doubt very much whether you get as good officers. I am happy to say that we have found that some of the highest qualified men in acquirements and who have been also the most skilful in the languages, have had other qualities combined with it, and they are just the very men that you would like to have, but you would not lose those men if you had a high qualifying examination; whereas when you come down to men of rather lower acquirements you may find a very fine fellow who has not the same ability for study, and although the man who studied with him may be a very inferior man in physique, yet he gets the preference.

111. Could not the two conditions, both mental and physical, be combined?—I think perfectly so.

112. But on the other hand, the one is no guarantee for the other?—No; there is no question about that.

113. I wish to ask you some questions upon a matter which the Commission have deliberated a good deal upon, and that is with reference to the highest age at which a man ought, with regard to the effi-

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

ciency of the service, to attain to the command of a regiment. It has been suggested that an officer to be active and energetic and capable of the arduous duties of a field officer in active service, ought not to be too old, and as the age at which an officer is best qualified for the service is a matter of cardinal importance in reference to the system that ought to be followed, what is your opinion upon that subject?—I think it is very difficult to put a limit of age, because men are so differently constituted. I think that you want younger commanding officers. The great bulk of the cavalry officers, as a rule, are younger men than the commanding officers of the infantry regiments, and I think it is a great advantage; but it is impossible to say that you do not find some extremely active men even after a good many years have passed over their heads, and it is very hard lines to say to those men, You are not to get the command of a regiment.

114. Therefore, you would be against a hard and fast line?—Yes, I should be against a hard and fast line certainly.

115. In constructing a system for the purpose of promotion, what is the age you would fix upon at which it would be desirable that a man should attain his rank?—I think he ought to have it at 40—40 is about the best age. I do not mind if he is 35, as far as I am concerned, but a man at 40 is a vigorous man.

116. If you were constructing a system with the view of getting efficient officers commanding regiments, what should be the limit of age?—I think he ought to be a commanding officer before 40; at 40, as a general rule, a man should have had 21 years' service, and that is the right age, no doubt. But then there are men at 50 that I have known myself who are quite as active as men at 40, and therefore I should not like to lay down a hard and fast line.

117. (*Lord Hampton.*) But in your opinion the nearer 40 the better?—I think that would be an advantage. We have a rule now that at 60 a man should retire from the command of his regiment.

118. (*Chairman.*) With the view of procuring fully efficient and active officers in the upper ranks it might be possible, might it not, to say that no man should become a major or field officer after a certain number of years' service?—I think so. If a man is not a major after 30 years' service, he ought to go at 30 years' service. We have men who are still captains at 30 years' service, but I think those men ought to go.

119. Do you think that it should be at no earlier period than that?—It is very hard lines for a man who has served well to say that he should go at an early period.

120. That would depend, would it not, upon the pension that you give him upon going?—If you induce a man to go at 25 years' service, I should not object to it at all; but I think it must be made worth his while. I think it would be very hard to make a man go after 25 years' service unless he could obtain some advantage in going.

121. Would it be possible to say that after a certain number of years he should not go forward to become major, but that he might remain on as captain if he liked?—In that case there comes the difficulty of seniority. If he is at the top of the list, and he is on service anywhere, whether home service or foreign, and the senior is out of the way, he must fall into the command; so that there is a difficulty in leaving a man who has been marked out as not altogether quite fit for promotion, whether from age or whatever it may be, in a position where he may fall into the very post that you have told him he is not fit to acquire.

122. You do not think, therefore, that that is a practicable system?—I would rather see other openings given. I think there are a great many openings that might be given to the army and which we ought to have for officers of that sort. I think that the great bulk of the officers of the Control Department ought to be officers of the army. I would not take men direct from civil life for this great department. In my opinion it is very undesirable to take those lads that are taken now from civil life instead of officers of the army for the Control Department or the Surveyor-General's Department, as it is now called, because I infinitely prefer that they should have been officers who have served in the army, and I am sure that you would be better served. I think that the paymasters of the army ought all to have been military men. You would find a number of officers, first rate fellows, who would do duties of that description uncommonly well, better than anybody else, and who would be only too glad to take these appointments, besides which it would be an immense saving in retirement. I would not take incompetent men. I have heard it said that this is only a mode of getting rid of men who are incompetent. I would not do anything of the sort, but I would take the most competent men. By that means it would give a flow of promotion, and it would be a benefit to the country both ways; the army would get promotion, and the State would be well served in the department to which those officers would be transferred.

123. Does that suggestion apply to the whole of the staff of the Control Department?—Yes, the greater part. There are certain appointments, for instance accountants, and duties of that sort, for which perhaps men ought to be brought up in civil life in order to become efficient; and I would reserve all those vacancies for civilians; but I think that the great bulk of the appointments are so closely identified with the general service that I believe they would be better filled by men who have served in the army than by anybody else, because they have more experience.

124. Are there any other departments of civil life to which the same remark would apply?—I think the two departments I have named are those for which officers are best qualified, because they are so immediately connected with and incorporated in the whole organization of the army. I venture to suggest this because I really think we have a sort of claim upon them, provided we give them good men. I am as strong as any man in my opinion that there ought to be tests as to qualification and a very large power of rejection on the part of the department. If an officer did not appear to be well qualified he could revert to the service until it was decided what was to become of him.

125. You must be aware that in order to produce the same flow of promotion as existed under purchase, one of two things would have to be done,—either that a very large voluntary retirement must be offered to men to induce them to leave the army, or after a certain number of years of service in a certain rank there must be a system of compulsory retirement, and that system of compulsory retirement has to a certain extent been adopted in what may be called the five years' rule, that is to say, in a man holding the position of lieutenant-colonel and major only for five years; do you see any objection to the application of the compulsory system where necessary to the lower ranks?—I think that the compulsory system had better remain with the lieutenant-colonel's rank with the fullest power of reappointment. My own opinion is that you ought to have reappointments frequently. I should use the five years' rule with great caution. I think that, under ordinary circumstances, a man ought to be allowed to continue after five years, but it is a very useful power to possess. With regard to majors, I hold that it would be utterly impossible to carry out that principle. You would have the whole of the half-pay list crowded with majors, and the question is as to what is to be done with them.

126. I understand your Royal Highness to say with reference to the five years' rule as regards the lieutenant colonel that you think it ought to be rarely resorted to, and that the rule ought to be rather to reappoint?—I certainly think so. At the same time I think it is an excellent power to possess, and a very valuable power to the authorities to be able to retire a man who they see is indolent and inefficient. Perhaps

he may be a very good man in other respects, and there may not be very much against him, still it is very desirable that at times the command of a regiment should change hands; and by having the five years' rule, when the whole of the five years have expired, you might say that a certain office should not be reappointed; whereas if he is a very good officer I think it would be a very serious loss to the State if he did not go on with the command; because in my opinion the best general officers are those who come either from staff appointments or from the command of regiments direct. I think that their becoming general officers after a long period of half-pay is most objectionable. —As regards majors, I hold that it would be impossible to carry out the rule, because as I have pointed out, what are you to do with those majors, if, after five years, they are put on half pay? How are they ever to come back again upon full pay? You thereby cut off promotion from a very large number of officers.

127. I observe from your answers that you regard the five years' rule from the point of view that it is a rule which may be taken advantage of in the case of an officer whom it is not desirable to continue in command?—Yes.

128. In the questions that I put to you I referred to the five years' rule rather as a method of creating promotion and giving steps in the ranks below, by rendering vacant the post of lieutenant-colonel in a regiment every five years, and thereby giving promotion every five years to the major below him and to the captain and the lieutenant and so on below also. Would you favour the Commission with your opinion upon it in that point of view?—I would answer that question very much as a corollary to what I have said. If it is the intention that, by the five years' rule, a man after five years' service is to be put aside altogether, I have no objection; but if it is that he is to be employed again, then I say I prefer no five years' rule. If it is to be a means of retirement, I say, apply the five years' rule to the full extent; but if it is merely to give a flow of promotion with the intention of bringing those men back to full pay, then I say do not apply it.

129. If it were coupled with this, that at the end of the five years when the command had expired a good retirement was offered to an officer, then the five years' rule you think might be acted upon rigidly?—Most assuredly. I have not the least objection to give every man after five years a good retirement, and let him retire altogether. That would be a very good way of offering a man retirement, because he has gone through all the grades of the service, and if he is not quite equal to be placed in the higher grades, he would be very glad to take the retirement; but I think in the case of a man who wished to serve on, and who would be allowed to serve on, if the State as well as the officer himself would be benefited by his being kept on, I would retain him. The worst thing that can happen to a man is to be on the half-pay list.

130. Do you apply that last answer to both lieutenant-colonels and majors?—I look upon the rule about majors and five years' retirement as it stands at present as inapplicable; I do not see how you could apply it. I do not see how those majors are ever to come back on full pay again. Besides, the Treasury would object to it, because you would always be increasing the half-pay list, or else it would have the effect of entirely stopping promotion in the army. If you took those men from the half-pay list and brought them back to full pay, there would be no promotion in regiments at all. That is not the case with the lieutenant-colonels, but that is the case with the majors, that you would be stopping the promotion in the army, for you would have to bring the majors back. Of course the Treasury would say, "We will not increase the half-pay list," and as you keep putting your men on half pay, of course you are increasing the half-pay list unless you take others again off the half-pay list to bring them into the regiment, and if you do that you stop the whole of the regimental promotions.

131. The effect of the system would be this, that whenever you applied the five years' rule to a major and put him upon half-pay you would create *pro tanto* for the moment promotion?—Yes.

132. But the moment you bring him back again on to full pay you stop promotion in the same degree that you previously advanced it?—Yes, and therefore you gain nothing. As I said, I think it would be extremely inconvenient financially because of the state of fluctuation in which this system would leave the half-pay list. There might be a large number of additional majors at one time, and then they would be taken off again, and of course that would reduce the half-pay list, and consequently you could never rely upon that mode of promotion.

133. As regards the majors, supposing that the five years' rule were acted upon, and it was supplemented by a system of retirement, what would you say?—If you gave them retirement that would be a very good thing. There are many old majors who have had nearly 30 years' service, and those you had much better retire after they have been five years majors, if they have not been promoted to lieutenant-colonels; and if they would take the retirement it would be a great advantage to the service; but I would only apply it in those cases.

134. With the view of creating promotion, would you think that a system which was based upon a rigid application of the five years' rule supplemented by an adequate retirement, both for lieutenant-colonels and for majors, would be an efficient means of carrying out the object?—It would be a great means to the end that you have in view—I do not say it would be sufficient, but it would be a great means to get a voluntary retirement, as you may say, instead of a compulsory one, which I do not look upon as a very legitimate or fair principle.

135. For instance, if a good retiring pension was offered to a lieutenant-colonel with the rank of general, would that meet your views?—Of course it would be a great advantage; it would be a step of rank as an honorary major-general, because a man would be a full colonel after he had served five years, and therefore if on retiring he would get the honorary rank of major-general, I have no doubt that a great many men would take it.

136. And it would have a good effect would it not in relieving the general officers' list?—Yes; in relieving the general officers' list first, and then giving a flow of promotion below. Those officers would not be put upon the general officers' list, they would only be honorary major-generals, and it would so far benefit the general officers' list that it would not be clogged with men, and at the same time it would give promotion below.

137. It would tend to make the general officers' list filled with younger men?—Yes, and the juniors would move up no doubt.

138. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Is your Royal Highness's objection to the five years' system grounded on the fact that it would add very largely to the number of half-pay officers, and not that you object to losing officers by permanent retirement?—My objection is a great deal more to clogging the half-pay list than it is to losing the officers. I think that you must lose some because, if you do not lose some, you will never get any flow of promotion at all, therefore I do not see any better mode of getting a flow of promotion than this mode. I have no doubt that we should lose officers, which I for one should very much regret; but still, as a rule, I think that the best men would stay, and that those who felt that the period of their life had arrived when they had better settle down would go, and I would re-appoint the most active men for future employment. Those men who saw their way to future employment would not retire, and therefore I think the army would gain very much by it.

139. (*Chairman.*) You are no doubt aware that under the purchase system a very large number of officers indeed retired from the army in the lower ranks both in the case of lieutenants and captains?—Yes. I am afraid that you will not find that to be

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge.

9 April 1875.

the case now, and that there will not be the retirement in the lower grades that there used to be.

140. When the present race of purchase officers have passed away there will be no inducement to them to retire?—No, there will be no inducement, and I am afraid that the tendency will be to hang on, and that we shall get into the state that the seniority corps were in at one time, that there was no promotion at all.

141. Under those circumstances would you or not think it desirable that some tolerably liberal pension should be offered to the younger officers for retirement?—I should like to see it go down quite to the lower grades, even to lieutenant. We have got lieutenants of 16 and 17 years' service. Those men are very unfortunately circumstanced—they must lose heart at not having got on, and I think that men of that sort had much better seek occupation elsewhere, and yet there is not a word to be said against them—they are excellent men.

142. Probably a not very large sum of money paid to them would enable them to do that, and seek their fortunes in civil life?—Yes, I do think so. I would observe, in reference to what I have suggested as to the Surveyor General's department and the Pay department, that officers so circumstanced would be the best men that they could have in those departments, and that it would be putting them in their proper position.

143. You would, I suppose, not carry such a system lower down than 10 years' service?—No, I would not.

144. You would say then that a commissioned officer should have, after 10 years' service, facilities for retirement within his reach?—I think it would be very desirable because it is the only way to get a flow of promotion.

145. It was practically the case was it not under the purchase system?—Yes, I think it is the only way to get promotion in lieu of what existed formerly.

146. Have you formed any idea as to what amount of pension would be likely to attract retirement in those ranks?—My own idea is that they should have full pay retirement, including their allowances. I think it is a great mistake to call it full pay retirement if pay only is given, and you do not give the allowances also. If you give a man full pay, plus his allowances, that would become full pay retirement, and I think many men would go.

147. What rank are you alluding to in that observation?—I would apply it through all ranks you propose to retire. I think that when it comes to the higher grades you would have to pay more. We find in the Royal Artillery that colonels will not take 600*l.* a year. We have had now several cases of that sort; and in the Royal Engineers we have 2,000*l.* or 3,000*l.* in hand, which we cannot dispose of, and which I should be very glad to make use of. I am sure there are officers who might as well retire, but you cannot force them to go, and they will not take 600*l.* a year. The Royal Engineers have much higher pay, and the Royal Artillery also have much better pay than the Line. They happen to be younger men now, and they do not want to go, and they will not take the retirement consequently. I merely name this to show that you must make it worth a man's while to retire, because if you do not do so they will not retire, and the money intended for this purpose is useless. At this moment we have several thousand pounds in hand in that way.

148. What is the superior attraction that induces men to stay on?—They get employed on the staff, and they get the command of an Artillery Brigade district after a certain time, besides getting a battalion as honorary colonel, and they would rather hang on for that than take the retirement, because it is a better thing. I am talking now of the Artillery and Engineers, and I think that is the reason.

149. In the meantime while a man is waiting in expectation of that advancement he is not worse off than if he took 600*l.* a year?—No, not any worse off.

150. That is the case with the Artillery and the Engineers?—Yes, we are worse off with regard to retirement in the Engineers than in the Artillery; officers are more indisposed to take it in the Engineers than in the Artillery.

151. Neither the Artillery nor the Engineers I think have had any system of retirement offered to the lower grades?—No, a lieutenant-colonel has half-pay after 25 years' and full pay after 30 years' service.

152. I mean after a small number of years' service?—No, nothing. The whole of the army is becoming too old for their respective grades. Retirement ought to be offered to men before they are so long in the service as 25 years. It ought to go much lower down; 25 years' service at present is the lowest age at which an officer can claim retirement to half pay throughout the service.

153. In the Marines how long is it?—I do not know.

154. Retirement by purchase did operate, did it not, upon the lower ranks in the Cavalry and Infantry very largely?—Yes, in the purchase corps, and it will do so for some time to come. We are still having the advantage to a great extent, of the purchase system in getting men to retire, but that will cease, of course, with the present generation of officers.

155. With respect to the rank of major-general the present system is that a man becomes major-general by seniority in the army, and upon becoming major-general he is entitled to certain pay; he is also open to receive appointments, and ultimately he has a prospect of receiving the colonelcy of a regiment?—Yes.

156. Is that system upon the whole do you think satisfactory?—It think it is satisfactory. It is better understood than any other that I could inaugurate, and I believe it is better than any other that I know.

157. No doubt a suggestion has been made at one time or another that it would be desirable to separate the fixed establishment of general officers into two lists, the one a sort of retired list and the other an active list?—It might be difficult to arrange it, but it would be very desirable.

158. What are the difficulties in doing it?—The difficulty consists in forming the retired list.

159. You might have a limit of age, might you not?—That is an arrangement I do not much like. I do not think that that is a good plan. You might say that if a man is not employed as major-general for five years after being made major-general, or is physically unfit, he should go on the retired list. I know general officers who have become quite unfit to serve, and there are on the major-general's list officers who are very excellent men, but who are worn out, but still they are on the list. I think that any man of that sort who, if he had to go before the medical board would be found not equal to active service again, might be put upon the retired list. I think that in the event of a double list you should select the honorary colonels for regiments from both lists. I would not prevent a man from getting a regiment if his former service justified it. I know men who are quite unfit for further service, but who yet have done great service in their day, and who very likely from that service have become inefficient; and surely you ought not to debar those men from getting the honorary colonelcy of a regiment. In this way and on these conditions you might have an active list and a retired list.

160. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert*). What would you say if a man had not been employed for seven years before?—You might fix the period at any time you thought most advantageous both to the State and the officer concerned. If he was not employed for five years or seven years after promotion you might put him on the retired list, but if he had seen good service in his day I should not debar him from getting an honorary colonelcy.

161. (*Chairman*). What would be the effect of making a separate list in such a case as that?—I

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

presume that you would then promote another man in his stead.

162. Taking the fixed establishment at 276, do I understand you to mean that removing this man on to the retired list you would look upon as creating a vacancy in the list?—Yes.

163. Then there would be an addition to the establishment?—Yes, certainly; it would in fact come to compulsory retirement at a certain period, but still to a certain extent, though compulsory, he would not be debarred from getting what he would be rightfully entitled to, had he remained on the active list, and which his previous services entitled him to.

164. Not only so, but it would practically add to the number of generals?—Yes, for that purpose, but not for active service.

165. For the purpose of both rank and pay it would be adding to the fixed establishment an additional expense?—Yes, no doubt.

166. But it would be an additional expense incurred with the view of creating promotion?—Yes, but without inflicting the hardship which would result to the individuals who were compulsorily retired and who would not have a prospect of getting the honorary colonelcy of a regiment. The old general officers would object very much to being compulsorily retired. They would say, it is very hard upon us for we have done all the services which would have entitled us to have the honorary colonelcy of a regiment. If you had a retired list from which you could select for these honorary colonels some of those who would otherwise be entitled to them, you would do away with the hardship of compulsory retirement in a great measure.

167. If some system of that sort were adopted it would be an outlet for those lieutenant colonels who had served their five years. I mean that they would come forward more rapidly?—No; those colonels who retired, as I understood the question that was put to me, would have to retire as colonels with the honorary rank of major-generals. That is a different thing again. Those men that I am now talking of have really obtained the substantive rank of major-general.

168. In addition to the retirement that you offered to those lieutenant colonels, you would have a more rapid promotion going on into the rank of major-general?—Yes; it would diminish the number of retirements in the rank of lieutenant-colonel, but it would benefit the whole, because the whole would move up.

169. And it would give you this further advantage, giving you younger major-generals?—Yes; certainly.

170. Also you would get another advantage, that your lieutenant-colonels would come on to be major-generals soon after they had taken their command, and not after they had been a long time on half pay, which is a very desirable thing to avoid?—Yes; quite so.

171. With regard to the mode of remunerating generals through the medium of those honorary colonelcies, you do not see any objection to that system as it is?—No; I think it is appreciated by the army; the army likes it on the whole, and I think it is generally acknowledged that those men who ought to get regiments do get them.

172. You believe that that is the general impression in the army?—Yes.

173. And in that sense the institution is one that carries out the system of promotion by merit?—Just so.

174. You would not fix upon any particular age as the limit?—If a man had been promoted for say seven or five years and had not been employed during that period, I think perhaps that it might be inferred that he had better be put upon the retired list. That matter requires a little calculation, because it is quite possible that we might not have the power of employing general officers within the five years, and it would be a hardship were such to be the case. I think any period might be fixed upon, which would give us the power of fairly employing a man, and if we had not done so it might be assumed that we did not intend to do so.

175. (*Maj. Gen. Herbert.*) If he became a lieutenant-general without having been employed as a lieutenant-colonel, what would you say?—Of course that is rather an exceptional case. He would have to qualify for five years before becoming a general officer. I think, however, that that is a matter for calculation; I merely throw it out as a suggestion.

176. (*Chairman.*) Supposing that after a man had completed his five years' service as lieutenant-colonel, and not received any staff employment, would not it be a hardship upon him?—But then a man would not have been promoted to full colonel if he had not been in a qualifying position. I think that in the case of men who had been fairly employed in brigade depôts, or on the staff, or in command of regiments, if there was no cause to say that they had not done their duty sufficiently well, you would not make any distinction between them.

177. That is, supposing that they had not been selected?—He must have been selected, because otherwise he could not have become a full colonel. He could not have been a full colonel unless he had been in a qualifying position.

178. He would be qualified for being a full colonel by having been in command of a regiment for five years, would he not?—If he were to command his regiment efficiently for five years, I think he ought to be promoted.

179. I understand your Royal Highness's proposition with respect to a double retired list of general officers to be entirely based upon the supposition that an addition is to be made to the number of the fixed establishment, and that the vacancies in that establishment caused by those who are put upon the retired list are to be filled up from the ranks below?—Certainly; that is the basis of my suggestion.

180. And unless that is carried out, you see no benefit in a retired list?—No; I do not think there would be the same benefit otherwise.

181. I also gather from your answers, that that system is probably the best system that could be devised to produce a flow of promotion?—I believe that you would not devise a better system, because I think that this would be fair to the individual, and a benefit to the State.

182. It is obvious, is it not, that that system would lead to an increased expense?—Certainly; but I apprehend that any system of retirement must do so; Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that this system which has now been suggested would be as useful and as valuable for the purpose as any other that you could devise.

183. Are you aware that the Commission which investigated a question similar to this in 1854 reported that an extension of the number of general officers would be a desirable thing in itself, but that it could not be entertained on account of the expense?—I am aware of that.

184. But looking to the present position of affairs, in which the State will have necessarily to incur large expense for the purpose of creating retirement and thereby promotion, in your opinion are the circumstances so changed that what was undesirable in 1854 might become highly desirable now?—That is exactly my view of the case. That which might have been considered very undesirable in 1854 has, by the force of circumstances and the great changes that have taken place, become almost necessary now, and I do not know any mode in which you could get a real flow of promotion and benefit the State at the same time more easily than that suggested.

185. Do you think that that is the best way for the State to apply the money which it must apply for the purpose of creating retirement?—I do think so.

186. It would be, I presume, with some fixed limit as to number?—I think it would be essential that there should be a fixed limit of number, because the

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

financial question, of course, would be a very important element in it.

187. But the number so fixed ought to bear, ought it not, some close relation to the rapid promotion which you wish to see established?—Yes, I think it should be regulated by the plan of promotion which you find essential, and which you cannot attain in any other way.

188. I presume that the system could not be a very rigid one?—It could not be made very rigid. It might be that there were more men who had not been employed for five years than you had vacancies for, and then you could not put them on the reserved list.

189. I understand your suggestion to be a general one; but you do not tie yourself down to details?—Not at all. I only throw out a general suggestion.

190. Take the system of a retired list, to be filled by officers who had not been called upon to serve actively for a certain length of time, the vacancies in the fixed establishment created by placing them on the retired list would have to be filled up from the ranks below?—Yes, including those unfit from physical causes; because I think that is important.

191. But if a retired list were created it should not debar those who are placed on it from their rights to an honorary colonelcy?—Just so. I think that is quite essential.

192. It has been shown to the Commission that possibly the most economical system of retirement for the army, so far as the State purse is concerned, might be found in some alteration of the present organization—the present organization of a regiment being that there is one lieutenant-colonel, two majors, I think 10 captains, and 10 or 12 subalterns; and it has been suggested that if an alteration could be made in that organization with due regard to the efficiency of the army, by increasing the number of majors, it might render the problem of securing an adequate flow of promotion on reasonable terms more easily. Have you considered that question at all?—I have the strongest possible objection to it, and I am very anxious to state that I think that nothing would be so undesirable, and it would be deplorable if so large an addition should be made to the field officers of the army. I think we have very much too many field officers now, and the consequences are very serious. You get a lot of men in the higher positions who feel it beneath them to do many duties which must be performed, and the result is that either their status is lowered by calling upon them to perform such duties or the duties are not done at all.

193. What are those duties?—I mean all those duties of the field and in barracks which we have now hardly sufficient subaltern officers to perform in some instances, and which consequently would have to be done by captains. Captains do not like to do them, and they do not do them properly, and it would become worse if you had more field officers; and if you had majors instead of captains, you would drag down the whole status of the upper grades, and you would largely increase the expenditure for the army; for, of course, every field officer, with his horses and allowances, and so on, is better paid than a junior officer, and the result is that whilst you increase the expenditure for the army you would, in my opinion, very much interfere with its efficiency, because the duties which ought to be performed by subordinate officers would either have to be performed by the officers who do not like to perform them, thinking them beneath their dignity, or very likely they would not be performed at all or, at least, not properly, because majors would object to do a great many duties which ought to be performed by subordinate officers, and if you have not the subordinate officers to attend to them, of course the majors must. I am very much afraid (without wishing to make any disparaging observation) that that is very much felt in the Indian army. At this moment the upper grades are so clogged with field officers that many duties fall to the share of the superior officers, who think it beneath them to carry out those duties. The great outcry has been (and others will be able to speak to that more than I can do) that most of the duties of the Indian army are now in the hands of field officers, and that they really ought to be performed by subalterns and captains. You drag down the status of the officers, and you increase very largely the expense of the army, because no doubt all the subordinate officers are much less paid than the seniors.

194. All that applies to the daily working of a regiment, but in time of war would the present system be more efficient or less efficient than a system which gave you a larger number of field officers?—I would have the present system, I would not go beyond it in the least. In our service we have a very large number of field officers. I do not like to compare ourselves to any other service because we are very peculiar, but you will find that the Prussians have not anything like the number of field officers that we have.

195. But then their unit is larger, is it not?—Yes, but they have much fewer field officers. I have not any objection to our captains being mounted, but they are not field officers, they are all captains.

196. As a question of organization would it be a beneficial change to alter the unit and turn a certain number of captains into majors?—No, that would not suit our service at all. I think our units are quite what they ought to be, and when those units are filled up as they ought to be, to 1,000 in a battalion of the line, and 100 or more duty men in a company, you have a very good company. If an English captain had the command of larger companies, say 200, he would find it a most unwieldy body, and it would not answer.

197. You do not think that the officers are at all too numerous?—Not at all, we have not officers enough at this moment. You could only increase the upper grade by sacrificing some of the junior officers, and I say that that sacrifice would not be justified.

198. (*Lord Hampton.*) Your Royal Highness has favoured the Commission with evidence so full, and so clear, that I think very little more remains to examine you upon, but there are one or two questions which I should be glad to put, arising out of your answers. I understood you, I think, distinctly to say that you approve of the present system, as I may call it, of promotion by seniority, and I also think I understood you to say that you regarded it rather as seniority tempered by rejection than as tempered by selection?—I used that expression, but I have not the least objection to say selection.

199. I apprehend that you contemplated both selection and rejection?—Yes, I contemplated both certainly.

200. I presume that you would consider that either rejection or selection would under the new system be mainly influenced by those confidential reports to which you have referred?—Mainly.

201. The manner in which those confidential reports would bear upon rejection is very clear, but in what way would you wish those confidential reports to bear upon selection?—We should know pretty well the qualities of all officers, more or less. Of course, by the confidential reports, those officers who have extraordinary merit, and who have been brought to the front in various ways, would be known to us, and we should select more upon our own views than upon any other persons. Those of the confidential reports as a matter of fact refer more to rejection than to selection. At the same time no doubt if a certain officer is shown to be of great merit, and if he could be exceptionally promoted it would be very advantageous in every point of view, and a note would be made to that effect, and when occasion offered he would be so promoted.

202. In the event of an officer being the subject of a very favourable report in a confidential communication, the advantages to that officer would be incidental according to circumstances?—Yes, every officer has a page set apart for him in which his name is recorded, and the opinions as to his merits

and demerits are stated. That is worked up from year to year, and then every incident to his favour, or the reverse, would be posted up against his name. By that means you have merely to turn to his name to ascertain in a moment how he is thought of in his regiment, or by his inspecting officer, or by any other military authority or any special incident which may have brought him into notoriety or distinction.

203. I think I understood you to express a very decided opinion that in the event of an unfavourable report against any officer in those confidential communications, you think that that unfavourable report ought to be communicated to the officer affected by it?—Yes, I think in all cases that should be done.

204. Should that be done directly?—I think so, at the time when it is made.

205. If that system of giving notice was generally adopted, do you see no risk of commanding officers being deterred from presenting a frank and confidential report, from the pain and disagreeable feeling that would be caused to them in communicating those unfavourable reports?—It has that great disadvantage no doubt, but, as I think I explained before, that is the great disadvantage of all those confidential reports, that the officers naturally do not feel very cordial to those who make reports against them, and there is always a certain amount of risk in that. At the same time I think there is very great risk in not letting a man know what there is reported against him. What I object to is that a man should not know that there is something against him, and that you are to go on living with him on cordial terms, as if there was nothing against him, because, if after two or three years it was brought up against him that he had been badly reported upon, and he would not be promoted, that would produce a most painful feeling not only in the individual but throughout the service. It would shake confidence in the position which every officer filled, and there would be a risk of great discontent.

206. The greater risk would be to postpone the communication?—I think so; it is a choice of evils.

207. With regard to what you stated as being done frequently in the cavalry, where a subaltern officer who is too young to make it desirable that he should succeed to the command of a troop,—in that case you bring in, do you not, a lieutenant from another regiment?—Yes.

208. In that case how are you guided in the selection of the officer?—If there were any special circumstances in favour of one officer more than another, no doubt I should select that officer who was most highly thought of; but we have taken it generally by army seniority. We have found lieutenants of 13 years' service; and in some regiments where perhaps the senior who was to be promoted was only of five years' service, I have taken the senior of 13 years' service and put him into that regiment. But the next promotion I would give to a man in the regiment so as not to take away the hope of promotion. I interlard them in fact in that way.

209. You have been asked about the Staff College; has it ever been at all in your mind whether for the interests of the army it might be well to make the Staff College a more extended establishment than it is, so as in fact to make it a military college, where a young man might have the advantage of studying his profession?—I would object to that very much. A man who will stick to his regiment will learn his profession in that regiment much better than in any college. I would prefer selecting a man even for the staff from the best regimental officers in the whole army.

210. I understand your opinion to be that the regiment itself is a better school for an officer to learn his profession than you could find in any college that might be established?—Most assuredly. I would say that it is quite a different question with the army from what it is with the navy. I am highly in favour of a naval college because the navy is not a continuous service as it is in the army. A man is only a few years with his ship, and he is put on half-pay; but a man's regiment is his home, and the more you make that regiment his home the better.

211. You are no doubt aware of what has lately taken place in the extended Naval College, that there is a complete system of professional training for officers which has been adopted with great advantage?—Yes, with the greatest advantage.

212. But I understand your opinion to be that you think from the differences which exist between the two services that that system, or any system like it, could not be beneficially applied to the army?—No, I think that the system in the army is better by having it a regimental system than by extending the academic system at a college, although I think it essential and most valuable in the navy.

213. Are there no particular branches of military study which you think could be better pursued in college than they could in the regiment excepting of course the Staff College?—If you wish to prepare a man for the higher branches of mathematics or fortification, it is essential that he should go into a college, because of course the regiment does not teach him that; but as far as the mere professional duties of an officer are concerned, including all such duties even as those of the staff, I believe he could acquire the great bulk of them better with the regiment than anywhere else, but at the same time if he is to have very high mathematical acquirements, including fortification, surveying, and gunnery, he must go to college, because he could not acquire them in the regiment.

214. I understand your opinion to be that as far as any exceptional training is concerned, the existing Staff College would be practically sufficient?—I think so. I hope it may be understood that whilst I am not sure that we always get the best officers from the Staff College, I am not at all disposed to offer any opinion against the Staff College as such. I think it is a very good thing to have such a college, but I am not sure that we always get the best officers for staff purposes in that way alone. I think it is a pity that in addition to the Staff College we do not open out the staff to officers who have not been at the Staff College.

215. As to the question of brevet, you are distinctly of opinion, are you not, that the system of brevet promotion has been carried too far?—I think we have had a great deal of it, but it is a very difficult thing to deal with, because of course when service in the field takes place there is a great pressure put upon us for brevet, and with very good reason, but it has gone a long way, I think.

216. When you say that it has gone a long way I presume you mean it has gone to an extent which produces practical inconvenience?—I think it has gone beyond what is perhaps convenient at times.

217. For instance, in the case of any foreign service, is it desirable that every officer who bore a share in that service should have brevet promotion?—No. I think that officers now often imagine when going on foreign service that they are sure to get it because they go on that service, and that I think is a great mistake. I think it is very much the opinion now-a-days amongst officers and their friends, that unless they get some brevet promotion they are discredited, and that they have done something wrong. I may say that that is a most mistaken notion, because I think brevet should be the exception and not the rule, whereas the feeling appears to me now to be that brevet should be the rule and non-brevet the exception.

218. And I understand you to express the opinion that you think it very desirable that that idea should be put a stop to?—Most assuredly.

219. And that brevet should be confined entirely to cases of distinguished personal services?—Most decidedly. Of course that answer does not apply to the brevet that we had to give the other day to bring up the captains of the army generally with reference to the Ordnance Corps. That brevet I advocated most strongly because it was a corrective brevet, I might say, and I hope it will not be assumed that I took

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

that into account when I was answering the question as to brevet.

220. I understood you also to express an opinion that you think one mode of rewarding merit would be by good service pay?—I think so. I suggested that merely as an alternative, and the only alternative that I could devise to meet the difficulty.

221. With regard to the first entrance into the army, you I think expressed a very decided opinion against a competitive examination, and an equally strong opinion in favour of a qualifying examination?—Yes.

222. In the event which has happened lately, I believe not unfrequently since the change of a large number of young men coming up for examination, at present they are so far examined competitively, are they not, that those who obtain the greatest number of marks obtained the first commission?—Yes, that is so.

223. In the event of the examination being merely a qualifying examination, so that every man who passed is really entitled to a commission, may I ask how you would regulate the order in which those young men should obtain their commissions?—That would be regulated of course according as they stood in merit as to qualification, and to that extent it would always be competitive, but it would not be competitive in this way, that those young men who did not pass sufficiently high in one competitive examination, then, to obtain their commission, would have to go up again for another competitive examination. There is nothing so distasteful or disagreeable to a man as being examined over and over again. If you have a competitive examination, they must be examined again, but if they had passed a fair qualifying examination, you would let them come in in the next batch, you would not renew their examination, whereas now those men have to go up again.

224. (*Chairman.*) You would not open the field again for fresh competitors with them, but you would say that if they had passed a sufficient examination on the first occasion they should get a commission although they would not get it at first?—Yes.

225. (*Lord Hampton.*) I understand you would retain the present system so far as awarding marks and giving commissions according to their number?—Yes, most assuredly, we always did so.

226. Is it not now the rule that there is a certain standard fixed, and in the event of a young man failing to reach that standard he loses the chance of a commission?—Yes; but there are a very great number of men who pass that standard, and yet have to go up again, because they have not come within the fixed number of commissions that are competed for.

227. With regard to your opinion that it would be well for officers of the Control Department to be selected from the officers of the army rather than civilians, would there be no difficulty upon the ground of age in carrying that out?—Not if you offered it to the lower grade of lieutenant, which I should certainly do. I would begin *ab initio*. If a man had been five years in the service, and he had an inclination to go into the Control Department, I should throw it open to him.

228. You are of opinion, are you not, that all the paymasters should be appointed from the army?—Most assuredly. I think if a man is thoroughly drilled and has thoroughly learnt his profession, any time you like to name after that if he chooses to go in for a different line from the actual military line, the opportunity should be given him. By that means you would, in my opinion, very largely increase the flow of promotion.

229. You have told us distinctly that you would not wish the five years' rule to be applied in all cases to the lieutenant-colonels, and in point of fact I think you said that the rule should be that they should be reappointed?—Whenever a man has shown efficiency and wishes to go on in the service, I should reappoint him.

230. Would not that practically put an end to the benefit of the five years' rule as aiding promotion in the army?—I think not, because otherwise you clog your half-pay list; and I have the strongest objection to the half-pay list being clogged. Anything you could do to get rid of the half-pay list I should rejoice at. Depend upon it half pay is our greatest inconvenience and difficulty, particularly in the upper grades. We have got men on half pay who are really excellent men, and we cannot employ them; therefore they become discontented. They come to me constantly, and I am obliged to tell them that I am unable to do anything for them, although I would be most happy to do anything for them that was in my power.

231. I think I understood you that your preference for reappointment would depend upon whether or not at the end of five years an officer is enabled to retire upon an adequate pension?—I think that it is scarcely the way in which I put it.

232. (*Chairman*). What I understood you to say was that at the end of five years if you had got to choose between keeping him on half pay and reappointing him, you would reappoint him?—Yes.

233. But if you had to choose between reappointing him and offering him an adequate retiring pension, if an adequate retirement was granted to him, you would say that the five years' rule might be acted upon rigidly?—Yes; you would use it more rigidly no doubt in such a case. All I object to is a man being put on half pay. He may be a most efficient man, but if he is left on half pay for the next five years he will become quite rusty.

234. (*Lord Hampton*). If that five years' rule is not rigidly carried out, what limit would you put to the command of a regiment?—I think I explained that I would retain the five years' rule, but I would not put it in practice except in cases where I thought it was for the benefit of the service. No man should be removed from his regiment unless he could get in some way an adequate retirement.

235. You spoke of the disinclination of the officers in the Artillery to retire even on 600*l.* a year pension unless they had their allowances, and I understood you to express an opinion that full pay retirement should include allowances?—Yes.

236. What allowances are those to which you refer?—All the allowances that an officer would be entitled to, if he was actually serving on full pay. The full pay for the army is only the full pay of his rank, and I say that it ought to include allowances as well. I am speaking of full pay retirement after 30 years' service. The 600*l.* for the Artillery is a particular grant.

237. I understood you to say that in the case of the 600*l.* a year, the Artillery officers do not like to take it?—No, they do not, because it is not good enough.

238. And in that case you think that they ought to have their allowances?—Yes, I instanced that to show that unless you make the allowances sufficiently good to make it worth a man's while to retire, you would only vote money which would be unemployed. I think that a man ought to receive the same pay on retirement that he gives up.

239. Did I correctly understand you to express a decided opinion in favour of the system of honorary colonelcies as a mode of rewarding officers?—Yes, I think it is a mode which is understood in the army and is appreciated.

240. Do you see no objection to the extreme inequality between 450*l.* a year, that an officer receives up to a certain day, and that he should then jump at once to 1,000*l.* year?—No, I think they perfectly understand it, and they are perfectly satisfied with it. I think if it was to be put to the vote they would all agree to it.

241. You think that that is preferable to any graduated scale of pay for general officers?—Yes, I do not think that there would be the least advantage in a graduated scale.

242. I think you expressed an opinion against a

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

change of the units in a regiment? Perhaps you may recollect that when I had the honour of holding the office of Secretary of State, I recommended a change in the cavalry unit which was at first adopted, but was afterwards reversed?—Yes, that was so.

243. May I ask what was the objection that was found in the cavalry to retaining the squadron as the unit?—Because we could not manage it. First of all we were obliged to have a quartermaster sergeant and sergeant-major per squadron, and then when we came to detachments we found it to work so very inconveniently that we could not get the unit together at all, and therefore it was thought much better to revert to the old system of the troop, and we went back to the troop as the unit.

244. Do you think that the same objection would hold good in the infantry?—Yes, I think so. I think the squadron always is the unit for cavalry in war, but the troop is the unit for peace service which is quite applicable to war, and which we find much more convenient in time of peace in our home establishment.

245. I presume that your main reason for not persevering with the squadron system was the difficulty with regard to detachments?—Yes, that was the reason that we found it so very inconvenient.

246. (*Maj. Gen. Johnson*) Are we to understand that you would not scruple to pass over an officer, who had failed to pass his examination for a superior rank?—Most assuredly I would pass him over, and we have done so frequently. We generally give him a little margin; we ascertain if there has been any real cause for his failure. Sometimes there has been some fault in the commanding officer in not sending up his name, and of course we give him the benefit of the doubt, but otherwise we should pass him over to a certainty.

247. Are you satisfied that the professional examinations now in force sufficiently prove an officer's fitness for his profession?—I do not know that you could improve them much; I do not think you could, but of course we modify them occasionally. We have done so frequently since the system has been in practice, and you can always do that, according to what you think at the time is essential for the officer to know. You could always increase it or diminish it as the case may be, but as far as I can judge, I should say it is sufficient.

248. With regard to brevet rank, it is a very economical mode, is it not, of rewarding officers for good service in the field?—It is the only economical mode that I can devise; that is what I suggested. The only alternative I know is one of pecuniary reward, entailing expense, which I rather hesitate to put forward, but still I thought it right, as I was asked the question, to mention it, because I could see no other mode of dealing with the difficulty.

249. It would be difficult and perhaps invidious to draw the line between the two systems, to decide, in fact, what should constitute a claim to brevet and what to good service pay as a reward for service in the field?—If you ask me whether any individual who was likely to come to the front would be very much more benefited by brevet promotion than by a good service pension, he probably would be so, but an officer who merely served for a certain period, and to whom actual promotion would be no great object, a married man, for instance, would feel himself considerably benefited by an increase of pay, but an active zealous officer, such as I have named in the course of our discussion, would be very much more benefited by brevet than by any good service pay.

250. But most officers would prefer the rank would they not?—Yes; I think as a rule they would.

251. An officer who had been passed over because he had become too old for promotion would hold a very anomalous position, would he not, among the men?—My opinion is, that a man who has been passed over for some default cannot hold his own, and that it ought to be a *sine quâ non* that that fact alone should induce him to retire. If a man has any proper feeling, I cannot imagine him remaining. I believe that is the way it is done abroad. There is that strong military sentiment among officers, that when a man is passed over twice he goes.

252. If from any cause an officer is passed over for promotion, you would wish him to leave the regiment?—If he is passed over by an officer in his own regiment I admit that that rule would hold good, but if I selected an officer from another corps, and brought him in, I do not think that the officer who is so passed over then is at all called upon to go; it may be that he is too young for promotion.

253. (*Chairman.*) In truth he would not have been passed over in such a case?—He is not promoted, but if he was passed over by one in his own regiment it ought to be the broadest hint that a man could possibly get, short of removal, that he ought to go, and that I expect him to go.

254. Practically that is the result, is it not; practically the man does retire?—He ought to go; he could not well remain.

255. (*Maj. Gen. Johnson.*) What are your Royal Highnesses's objections to compulsory retirement; supposing an adequate pension were given, and it were necessary, you would not entertain a great objection to that?—I think you would be obliged to have recourse to it if you could not do it another way, but I dislike it very much. If you could get retirement without compulsion I would prefer it, but if it is essential to the plan of promotion, and if it came to an absolute necessity to choose between compulsory retirement and no plan of promotion, I am afraid I must agree to compulsory retirement.

256. Then the pension ought to be exceptionally good, ought it not?—Yes, and therefore I would prefer any mode of retirement that was not actually compulsory, if it could be adopted.

257. (*Maj. Gen. Herbert.*) Would it not be possible in many cases to give some decoration, accompanied with a pecuniary reward, instead of brevet?—I have no doubt that the officers of the army would appreciate that very much, because any little thing of that sort is very much appreciated.

258. For instance, something like the Legion of Honour, which is given in France, if it carried a small sum of money with it?—There is no doubt that it would be appreciated; but you must bear in mind that the Order of the Bath is so much valued, because it is so very rarely given. If you make those honours very much more *répandu*, or more extended, the honor itself becomes less valuable. As I say, the reason why the order of the Bath is so much appreciated has been because it is very difficult to get it.

259. As in the Artillery and Engineers the number of field officers is in the proportion of one to three; whereas, they are in the proportion of one to six in the line; would it not be necessary to give brevets continually, in order to prevent supercession?—I think it is a very grave question, and that is the only argument that you could put forward for having more field officers in the line; but I must say that my feeling is very strong against increasing the number of field officers. Even in spite of that argument, I was obliged to give the answer that I gave to the noble chairman, when I said that I objected to more field officers, and I adhere to that opinion. The corollary to that I leave the Commission to draw.

260. (*Maj. Gen. Foster.*) Do you consider the number of officers in a battalion or regiment equal to its requirements, or is the number too small or in excess, and if equal to, do you think that that number should be diminished by officers being taken from it to serve on the staff?—I have already explained my opinion that there ought to be three officers per troop and company. It is possible that in time of peace you could do with less at home, but the service abroad is so frequent, and the changes of establishment are so constant, that I think it would be very much better that you should have three officers to a troop or company at all times. And for India I contend that there ought to be four. I cannot conceive how you are to

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

9 April 1875.

get on in India without four, in fact the complaint now of regiments being with too few officers is constant. The consequence of that must be that the duty is not properly performed. Now when you have, as you will have, so very many young non-commissioned officers, the necessity for more officers is very evident. If the duties are neglected by the young non-commissioned officers owing to their having no sufficient number of commissioned officers over them, it will be a very serious detriment to the service, and therefore I am strongly of opinion that you ought to have three officers all round both per troop and per company, and in India four.

261. (*Chairman.*) Is that more or less than the present number?—More than the present number. We have now on the home establishment 10 companies, five of them with three and five with two officers. In the cavalry, out of eight troops we have four with three, and four with two officers only. I say that we ought to have three all round, one captain and two subalterns, and in India four.

262. (*Lord Hampton.*) Has that been long the case?—No, this is a new regulation.

263. You used to have three all round, did you not?—Yes. I also think that every officer on the staff ought to be made supernumerary, because I think every officer that belongs to a regiment ought to be available for duty with the regiment. I would not put the officer on the staff on half pay. I think that very unfair, because a man loses his promotion. I would leave him as he is in his regiment as a supernumerary. He would get his half pay, but he would remain in his position in his regiment.

Adjourned to Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Tuesday, 13th April 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Sir G. Airey, G.C.B.

13 April 1875.

General SIR RICHARD AIREY, G.C.B., examined.

264. (*Chairman.*) You hold the position of adjutant-general of the army, do you not?—Yes.

265. The Commission want to have the benefit of your opinion upon some of the matters which have come under discussion, and the first that I should like to ask you about is, as to the general system of promotion, whether it ought to be a promotion by seniority or wholly a promotion by selection, or partly the one and partly the other?—I am in favour of what is called promotion by seniority, tempered by selection.

266. By promotion by seniority, do you mean promotion by seniority in the regiment, or seniority in the army?—Seniority in the regiment, if an officer is qualified.

267. The promotion by seniority in the regiment necessarily brings about a great difference from time to time in the rate of promotion in different regiments?—Yes.

268. Is that a great evil in your opinion?—No, on the contrary, I think it is rather an advantage. It brings forward young men, and therefore in the higher ranks of colonels and general officers you get younger and more physically efficient men.

269. On the other hand, does that inequality in the rate of promotion in different regiments create any appreciable degree of discontent in the army, do you know?—I do not think so. I think it is quite understood in the profession.

270. Assuming that promotion should, as the rule, be according to seniority in the regiment, if the officer is qualified, still you think that the present system, which has been, in fact, created by the abolition of purchase, namely, the power of the Commander-in-Chief to supersede that seniority by selection, is a valuable thing to be continued?—Quite so.

271. With regard to selection, we understand that there are reports furnished annually by the commanding officers of every regiment, endorsed to a certain extent by the general, with regard to the capacity, good conduct, and general ability of all the different officers in the regiment; we understand that that is the system that exists. Is that, do you think, an effective system so far as it goes?—I think it is, and it is carried on very critically. The commanding officer of the Regiment is obliged to attend personally with the general and to go over the reports upon all the officers, and to explain personally his reasons for either the recommendations, or the rejections that he has reported.

272. Do those reports come under your particular cognizance?—No, they come under the military secretary principally.

273. Do you consider that those reports, so far as you have hitherto had an experience of them, are reliable and satisfactory in their result?—Yes, I think they give the Commander-in-Chief quite reliable information as to the characters and qualifications of the different officers.

274. Are you aware that the Commander-in-Chief does sometimes, in consequence of those reports, intimate to an officer that he cannot recommend him for promotion?—I think not unfrequently an officer is not promoted, and of course he is aware that the reason is that the report has not been favourable, but I think, in every instance where an officer is passed over, he should be made acquainted with the fact of the cause.

275. What do you think as to the propriety of acquainting him with the facts, and if he is to be told that he has been unfavourably reported upon, when do you think that the fact should be communicated to him?—I think he ought always to be acquainted with the fact at the time that he is passed over.

276. It has been suggested that it is right that when a commanding officer makes a report adverse to any officer under his command, he should at that time let him know of it, do you agree with that?—Yes, I think he should.

277. That is not done now?—Not as a rule.

278. It is done by some commanding officers, is it not?—Yes, but it is not the positive rule.

279. Would it be desirable, in your opinion, to enforce that as a rule?—Yes, I would enforce it as a rule, and let the officer be made acquainted with the reason why he is not recommended.

280. Would communicating an adverse report be likely to increase or to lessen, do you think, the unpleasant feeling that must be generated in the mind

of an officer by the fact of that report?—I think it would be calculated to stimulate an officer, and that he would receive it in a proper way.

281. You think that it would stimulate him to more attention to his duties?—Yes.

282. If, as I understand, on several occasions those reports have been acted upon I suppose we could get the details?—Yes, I presume so.

283. Do you think that if this system of reports is continued and if the Commander-in-Chief continues to act upon them, they will afford a sufficient method of bringing forward the capable men to commands?—Certainly. Where an officer is what you may term superseded (not rejected, but superseded) there are other circumstances very often which influence the Commander-in-Chief. It is not incapacity exactly in the officer, but it may be too short a service, so that it would be an injustice to the service generally to promote him at once.

284. That would arise in a case in which there was very rapid promotion in a regiment, as the Commander-in-Chief told us the other day in that state of things he very often took a man from another regiment where the service of the next man in the regiment was very short?—Yes, that is so.

285. When a man is superseded by reason of an unfavourable report, is it your opinion that he ought to be allowed to remain in the army or not?—I do not think that it ought to go entirely by the actual report. There ought to be oral evidence of the circumstances with regard to the officer besides the mere report.

286. That is so far as regards the means of arriving at a conclusion whether he ought to be superseded or not, but what I wanted to know from you was, assuming that there are satisfactory reasons why he ought to be superseded, do you think that he ought to be allowed to remain in the army, or ought it to involve his retirement?—I think it ought to involve his retirement.

287. In one of the answers which you have given with reference to promotion by seniority and so forth, you were speaking of officers of all ranks, were you not?—Yes, officers of all ranks.

288. Do you think it would be desirable to fix any number of years' service which had been achieved by an officer before he would be entitled to promotion to the rank of a field officer?—No, I think not, provided it was not manifestly unjust to the service.

289. That is to say, you would not fix any definite number of years' service which should be a necessary condition of a man receiving the commission of a field officer?—No, I would not.

290. On the other hand, and reversely, would you consider that it is desirable to fix any number of years' service after which a man should not be eligible to be a field officer, with a view to the production of a class of intelligent officers of earlier age?—I should be inclined to say that after a certain number of years' service, an officer under the rank of field officer should be retired.

291. That is to say, that a captain after a certain number of years' service should be ineligible to become a field officer, and should be retired?—Yes.

292. Have you fixed any number of years in your own mind as to where you would draw the line?—I think in the lower ranks it is difficult to do so, but I think, with regard to a captain after 20 years' service in the whole, if he is not about to be promoted he ought to retire.

293. And that the State should furnish some reasonable retirement for him with relation to the number of years' service?—Yes, it must be a fair retirement.

294. Perhaps a larger retirement than if it were a voluntary retirement?—Certainly, if it is compulsory.

295. What proportion to his full pay ought such retirement to bear do you consider?—I think that in compulsory retirement an officer ought to retire upon his full pay. But there is another question, which is, whether you would give him the money value of his allowances, if you force a man to retire from the service and give him full pay, he is in a very different position from what he is when he was in his regiment, when he got his lodgings, his fuel, his lights, and the advantage of a soldier servant. I think, if he is compelled to retire against his will you should give him the money value of those allowances.

296. Then you would say as regards a captain who had not got promoted after he had had 20 years' service it would be desirable for the benefit of the service, that he should be retired upon a pension, which should equal his full pay and the allowances?—Yes.

297. What is the value of a captain's allowances; how much is it worth in a year?—I should suppose it would be worth about 60*l.* a year.

298. The full pay of a captain is 211*l.* 7*s.* 11*d.*, therefore, it would be 271*l.* a year which you would say would be the retirement which should be offered to a captain for compulsory retirement?—Yes, after 20 years full pay service.

299. Would not the effect of so dealing with the service be to create a younger body of field officers than we have hitherto had?—Certainly. The question of retirement is a very difficult question, because if you make it too good some of the best men, still comparatively young, may take advantage of their retirement to follow other pursuits in the city or the colonies, and so forth, leaving the drones of the service in the army.

300. Does not that suggestion of yours, which is most valuable, apply more to the case of voluntary retirement than to the case of compulsory retirement?—Certainly, I was alluding then to voluntary retirement.

301. You were alluding to this as a difficulty which will always beset the question of voluntary retirement?—Quite so.

302. If it is not sufficiently large, it will not effect its object, and if it is larger than it need be it will carry away some of the best men?—Quite so.

303. You have mentioned that the system of acting upon those yearly reports would, in your opinion, be sufficient to secure the promotion of fit and capable men in the army. Does any other system occur to your mind by which any young men of merit or capacity might find their way upwards in promotion more rapidly than they can do by mere seniority?—I do not think there is any other way, than the reports of the superior officers, who bring to the notice of the Commander-in-Chief any particular merits that an officer may possess.

304. The Commission have been given to understand that the way in which those reports are acted upon is only negatively, that is to say, by refusing promotion to an unfit man. Those reports have never been acted upon hitherto, have they, to induce the Commander-in-Chief to select a young man and put him over the heads of others?—When the Commander-in-Chief makes promotions and selections, particularly for staff employments, he takes up the reports that have been made, and the oral testimony that he has received of the characteristics of any particular officer.

305. That applies to staff appointments, but it does not apply to regimental promotion, does it?—Regimental promotion does not always go in the regiment, there are frequent occasions in which the Commander-in-Chief promotes into another regiment. There have been cases of that sort constantly.

306. That has been by reason of distinguished merit, has it not?—Yes; from the reports that have been made of the officers and the way in which they have been brought under the notice of the Commander-in-Chief.

307. Is that done directly by removing a man from a captaincy in one regiment to a majority in another?—Yes, occasionally.

308. Not by giving him unattached promotion in the first instance, and then bringing him back to full pay?—That has been had recourse to also, but it is avoided as much as possible, from the extreme diffi-

Sir R. Airey, G.C.B.

13 April 1875.

culty of bringing a man from the unattached on to the full-pay list again.

309. You do not think that unattached promotion is a desirable method?—No, for the reason above stated.

310. But it is far more desirable, if you wish to take advantage of a man's ability or capacity, to lift him at once from his rank in one regiment to a superior rank in another regiment?—Certainly.

311. Would it be desirable to lay down any rule of this sort, that a certain number of such promotions by selection should be given every year?—I do not think that that would be possible.

312. What would be the obstacles in the way?—We should not really know how to fix any number, because the number of promotions must depend upon the vacancies that arise.

313. The number of vacancies in each year, I suppose, is something very much the same one year with another, and at any rate you might fix an average; supposing that the average number were, say 100, you might say that out of these 100 vacancies you would devote 30 to promotion by selection, to that extent, overriding regimental seniority?—I think it would be much better to leave every vacancy to be filled up as it occurs at the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief unfettered by any general rule.

314. I presume it would not be practicable in any case to use the power of selection in a regiment by promoting a man in his own regiment over the heads of those who were his seniors?—I think not.

315. You think that it would produce too much ill-feeling?—Yes, and dissatisfaction.

316. It would not be a practical available working way of dealing with the question?—I think not.

317. With regard to the staff, at present the staff is filled entirely by selection, is it not?—Yes, entirely by selection for merit and service.

318. I think His Royal Highness told us the other day that the lower grades of staff appointments are all filled from men who have passed the staff college?—Yes, that is so as a rule.

319. But the higher grades are not so restricted?—They are purely by selection.

320. What is your opinion as to the desirability of re-appointing to the staff men who have previously filled staff appointments and thus confining the staff appointments to a limited number?—I am very much in favour of a limited period of the staff employment of officers, of course the Commander-in-Chief being vested with a discretionary power of re-appointing when he thinks it desirable for the service, but I am very much in favour of a limited period of staff employment, it widens the field very much for officers generally, and a great many more officers become qualified for staff employment.

321. There is a limit now, is there not, to any particular appointment that it only lasts for five years?—For five years only.

322. When you speak of limiting staff appointments you mean adhering to the rule of five years, some of the officers being liable to be re-appointed after the expiration of five years?—No, I prefer that the Commander-in-Chief should have the power, where it is for the good of the service, to re-appoint.

323. What is your opinion as to the desirability of exercising that power, except in special instances?—I think it ought to be confined to special instances.

324. So that upon the whole, as I gather your opinion, you would be rather in favour of not appointing the same man over and over again, but of distributing the appointments more widely amongst the army?—Certainly.

325. Of course in a case of emergency you would naturally recur to the men who had had the most experience?—Yes.

326. But in ordinary times it would be desirable, would it not, to change?—Yes.

327. So as to distribute more widely the advantage of staff appointments?—Yes.

328. It would give you a larger class of men instructed of the business of staff officers?—Exactly so.

329. And you think that that would be a desirable result?—I think so.

330. With regard to regimental promotion, you have said that the rule ought to be promotion by seniority in the regiment, do you draw any distinction between promotions to the rank of major or lieutenant-colonel as distinguished from those in the lower ranks, or do you apply the observation generally that seniority ought to be the rule in all grades and ranks?—I think it should be the rule in all ranks.

331. You would let the senior major become, as a matter of course, a lieutenant-colonel, unless there was something definite against him?—I go rather beyond "something definite against him," he must be really shown to be perfectly qualified, the mere circumstance of there being no reports against an officer I do not think is sufficient.

332. You think that the Commander-in-Chief ought to be affirmatively satisfied that the senior major is qualified for the command?—Yes.

333. I suppose it is quite possible that a man might be fit to do the duty of major without being qualified to take the command of a regiment?—Quite so.

334. Do you apply that same rule to the appointment of the senior captain to the grade of major?—Yes, up to a field officer I should do the same. A man might be a very fair and irreproachable captain of a company, but really not fit to be a field officer.

335. You draw this distinction between the rank of a field officer and the subordinate ranks that you think that the Commander-in-Chief ought to be satisfied affirmatively that the man is fit for the grade before he is promoted?—Yes.

336. And again in such a case as that, even though not reported against, would it be your opinion that if he were so passed over he ought to remain in the army or not?—No, not in the junior ranks, but I would not force a captain out; there may be circumstances which have prevented his promotion.

337. Suppose he were passed over a second time, would that make any difference?—Yes, if he were passed over a second time as disqualified I think he ought to retire.

338. We have had some propositions before us with reference to brevet rank; generally speaking, we have been given to understand that promotion by brevet has been somewhat too lavishly bestowed of late years; is that your opinion?—I am very much of that opinion.

339. Brevet rank we understand is liable to the evil that a man may hold high rank in the army, say the rank of lieutenant-colonel or colonel in the army, and at the same time be doing duty in his regiment as captain?—Yes, that is so.

340. Do you consider that an evil?—I consider it a very inconvenient arrangement indeed.

341. Does it interfere with the efficiency of a regiment, do you think?—It may interfere very much with the efficiency of a regiment; a captain may be a lieutenant-colonel and he may actually be senior to the lieutenant-colonel of his own regiment; there is always an awkward feeling about it.

342. It often is so, is it not?—Occasionally; not often.

343. Two men so placed can hardly act harmoniously, can they, in their respective positions?—No, they cannot.

344. That is an evil attending brevet?—Yes, and a very great evil.

345. What is the benefit, do you consider, of the brevet system?—It is the only means at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief for rewarding officers for any distinguished service; but it is not practised in any other army in Europe.

346. The Commission have been told that it is not only the means of remunerating officers, but that it places an officer in such a position, owing to his higher army rank, that Her Majesty can afterwards avail

herself of his services in a way that she could not otherwise have done?—There is no doubt that that is the case, but I would very much rather that the man was noted for any particular merit or any particular service that he had performed, and that the Commander-in-Chief should have the power afterwards of giving him substantive rank and employing him in any way in preference to brevet.

347. You suggest something of this sort as I understand; supposing a captain had distinguished himself, and the Commander-in-Chief was desirous of putting him forward for future promotion, a possible way of doing it would be to note his good conduct, and to enable the Commander-in-Chief afterwards to act upon that by giving him substantive rank in a higher grade?—Yes, and any employment he thought proper.

348. Can he not do that now?—It is not the system at present. On service, the whole list of officers, are sent in upon the recommendation of the general officers commanding divisions or brigades, and they get brevet rank.

349. Is there anything to prevent the Commander-in-Chief now from promoting a captain who had very much distinguished himself to the rank of major?—No; there is nothing to prevent him. I have thought that instead of brevets possibly you might extend the lists of reward for what is called distinguished or meritorious conduct, for which officers will get 100*l.* a year. Officers are put upon that list, and I think that that might be extended; possibly it might be accompanied by some decorative emblem importing that they are upon this list, so that it would not interfere with rank.

350. Such a system as that would be a mere remuneration to an officer. What seems to be desirable is, that there should be connected with the remuneration of the officer a power of the State availing itself of that officer's services in a higher rank than that in which he stands?—Then the Commander-in-Chief would have that power, and he could afterwards employ him in any position he liked.

351. So that a substitute for brevet, as I understand, in your opinion, might be created in this way, that a list should be made, and when a man has distinguished himself his name might be put upon that list, and that the effect of his name being upon that list would be first, that he would be entitled to good service annual payment, and, secondly, that there would be an understanding that from that list the Commander-in-Chief would from time to time take men for the higher ranks and higher employment, and also it should be accompanied with a decoration?—Yes, and without any invidious feeling being created, something in this way might be arranged.

352. Then upon the whole, I understand, rather that you are against the system of brevet continuing?—Yes, I am against the system of brevet as being very inconvenient.

353. And you think it fairly might be substituted by some such system as has passed through your mind?—I think so.

354. Supposing that the system of brevet remains, do you see any practicable method by which it could be limited in its application, so that the excesses which you say have taken place of late might be controlled?—Judging from what I have seen on service, I think it would be very difficult. It has been the custom always for general officers to recommend in high terms those officers who have been employed immediately under their own command and personal observation, more or less, and those lists have swelled out to very large dimensions and difficult to disregard.

355. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) So that it becomes a reflection upon a man to be excluded?—Yes; it is almost a reflection upon him, and all those inconveniences and incongruities which take place afterwards in the regimental relations are the consequence.

356. Do you know when brevet was first introduced into the army?—No, I really do not, but it is very ancient.

357. (*Chairman.*) You say that it does not exist in any foreign army. Have the French no such system?—No, nor the Germans. In the Prussian army it is entirely in the hands of the King himself, and he takes up any officer he chooses, in any rank he chooses, and puts him where he likes, and gives him any rank he likes.

358. Such a system as that would not, I presume, be applicable to this country?—No; I think not. In the Prussian army they have certain examinations, and the officers who pass those examinations get rank.

359. Do you think that an examination is capable of giving a satisfactory result as to the capacity of an officer?—No; I am not in favour of a scholastic examination as a test of the efficiency of any officer.

360. Examinations address themselves only to proof of intellectual acquirements, do they not?—Yes.

361. And you do not rate that as very high amongst the qualities of officers of the army?—No, I have never found it so myself in practice. I find that there are other attributes, and characteristics which have been much more valuable on service.

362. To go to another part of the subject, what is your opinion as to the oldest age at which a man ought, if at all, to become field officer?—I have always considered that age is a very false criterion of any man's efficiency. You may find a man of 60, who very likely may be positively a better man than a man of 45, and, therefore, it is a very difficult thing to fix age as a rigid rule.

363. But speaking generally, there can be no doubt—I presume, that there is a period of life at which, as a general rule, a man becomes more or less unfitted to command a regiment?—As a general rule that is so.

364. At what age would you desire to see a man take the command of a regiment as a limit with the view to the efficiency of the service?—At present we have got the age of 60 for an officer commanding a regiment at which he must give up, but I do not think that any man ought to get the rank of major who was 50 years old.

365. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) You have already said that a man ought to retire after 20 years' service as captain, and by that rule he would be a field officer at 40?—Yes.

366. (*Chairman.*) If he was to have five years as major he would get the command of a regiment at 45?—I think a man might certainly be allowed to get command of a regiment at 45.

367. If the five years' rule were adopted his command would terminate when he was 50, subject of course to exceptions?—Yes.

368. What do you say about the existing rule of an officer holding the post of a commander of a regiment for five years, do you think it is a desirable rule to be continued?—I think it is a good power to possess, but not to be exercised as a rule. If an officer be otherwise a good man, but really not fit to command a regiment, it is a very good power for the Commander-in-Chief to act upon without invidious reflection and thus relieve him from the command.

369. I imagine that this rule has been framed in a totally different aspect from that, namely, that in that way you would create a definite stream of promotion from below?—Yes, that was the object of it.

370. Do you think that in that point of view it is a desirable or practicable rule?—With regard to creating a stream of promotion there is no doubt it would have that effect, but I do not think it would be a beneficial practice for the service.

371. You think that so far as efficiency is concerned it should be left to the Commander-in-Chief, whether he will employ a man for five years or ten years as the commander of a regiment?—Quite so.

372. Then comes the question as to what is the desirable mode of dealing with those lieutenant-colonels who have served their five years, and who, if there is to be this five years' rule, would have to give up their command at the end of that period, what should become of them?—They must go on half-pay or be given other employment.

Sir R. Airey, G.C.B.

13 April 1875.

373. Do you think that that is desirable?—No, quite the contrary.

374. The present system is that they must go on half-pay, and remain on half-pay until they go forward by their seniority in the army, and there is a vacancy in the fixed establishment of general officers?—Yes.

375. And you think that that is not desirable?—I think it is not desirable.

376. Why do you think so?—Because it is very hard for a man who has spent his whole life in the service, and is at such an age that he cannot take to anything else that he should be suddenly deprived of all the advantages which that service has entitled him to, and that he should be put upon the shelf with very little power on the part of the authorities of employing him.

377. There are brigade depôts, and some staff appointments that are open to him, are there not?—Yes, recently created.

378. But I suppose that those would not provide for more than a limited number?—Only for a limited number and probably no vacancies.

379. Does not also the fact of his being thrown out of gear render him less fit to perform the duties of major-general?—Yes. I was going to say that after a man is put aside, and he has been a certain number of years without practice in his military duties, he gets rusty and at last almost unfit to keep up with the times.

380. If that system is not adopted there seems to be only two alternatives to choose from, one of which would be to offer him retirement and let him quit the army, and the other would be to make him a major-general, by increasing the number of major-generals?—Yes. Or come to compulsory retirement at certain ages.

381. That would be your way of meeting the difficulty, that after he had fulfilled his five years' command, and attained a certain number of years' service you would retire him compulsorily?—Yes, but always with the understanding that he is liberally provided for.

382. What would you consider a liberal provision under those circumstances?—I should carry it out on the same principle as I said before, give him full pay and allowances, and put him into a new retired rank, that is to say, I should give him a step of honorary rank.

383. You would give him a retirement and a pension equal to his full pay with his allowances?—Yes.

384. When you say that you would do that after a certain number of years' service, what number of years would you fix upon?—In the case of a general officer, if he is not employed within a certain number of years, say for five or seven years, I think that then he might be retired, but this is more an actuarial question.

385. My question rather applies to lieutenant-colonels, you would not compulsorily retire the lieutenant-colonels?—No, not as a rule.

386. Your compulsory retirement would be in the case of general officers?—Yes.

387. Then you say that you would draw the line in this way, that you would retire a general officer who has not been employed for five years?—I could not exactly say the precise number of years, but a certain number of years, perhaps five or seven.

388. But after that time he should be retired compulsorily?—Yes, but a lieutenant-colonel, I should go on half-pay with the chance of being employed either on the staff or brigade depôt, or in any way that the Commander-in-Chief could find employment for him.

389. I understood you to say that you were against the system of a lieutenant-colonel remaining as it were on the shelf for some time before he became a general officer?—I do not call it being on the shelf if he goes to a brigade depôt, or is employed on the staff.

390. I thought you said that such employment could only be given to a limited number?—It is so.

391. Then a large number would be on half-pay doing nothing?—Yes, a certain number.

392. It was with reference to them that I suggested the question to you as to what you would do with them, would you deal with them by granting them a pension, and allowing them to retire?—Yes; they should retire upon the same principle as the others, namely, full pay and allowances after a defined age.

393. Another method of dealing with the lieutenant-colonels would be to increase the number of general officers which would of course render promotion into the fixed establishment more rapid; have you considered that question?—Yes, you might increase the number of general officers to a moderate extent, provided you had an active and a retired list of general officers.

394. In order to increase the number on a fixed establishment you would draft out of the entire list a certain number that you would put upon the retired list?—Yes.

395. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You would draft them out by age as I understand you?—Yes, by age.

396. (*Chairman.*) And by non-employment?—Yes, I should also be glad to see an end put to the system, which has prevailed for a very great number of years. There are some officers who have been on half-pay, I suppose, between 40 and 50 years drawing half-pay, and have never since done a day's military service of any description and never intended doing any. There are officers in the Army List who are general officers who have been once captains and have been drawing half-pay for the last 40 or 50 years.

397. But they do not draw half-pay when they are general officers, do they?—If they have not been employed, they draw the half-pay of the regimental rank that they did hold.

398. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) But that could not take place again, could it, because no man can become a full colonel unless he qualifies for that rank?—No, but formerly it was so. There are men now who never had a higher rank than that of captain and they have been drawing captain's pay from that day to this.

399. (*Chairman.*) That exists now as regards certain persons, but it could not occur again, because a man must qualify to become a general officer, and he can only do that by having served five years with his regiment?—Just so.

400. If you had a retired list in the way that you suggest, would you give those on the retired list an opportunity and chance of getting an honorary colonelcy?—Yes, I would continue that advantage to them

401. Upon the whole, you are satisfied with the system of these honorary colonelcies as a mode of rewarding men?—Yes. I prefer that to any modification that I have heard suggested.

402. You would prefer it to distributing the same money more evenly over the entire body?—I think so.

403. With reference to promotion and the means of procuring promotion, you are aware that under the purchase system a very large number of officers sold out and left the army in the lower grades; is it desirable in your opinion, in framing any measure that is to take the place of the purchase system, to offer inducements to men in the lower grades of the army to retire?—Only after a certain number of years' service, allowing them to retire upon their full pay.

404. That would be a compulsory retirement, I presume, on full pay?—Yes.

405. But might you not offer with effect a voluntary retirement at a reduced amount?—Yes.

406. And in that way produce a current of promotion through the lower ranks?—Yes.

407. And that you think would be desirable?—Yes, I think it would be very desirable.

408. Have you ever thought what amount in each rank would be likely to tempt a man to retire?—No, I have not considered that question.

409. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Do you not consider that men would retire now for a less sum than they

would under the purchase system? — I think perhaps they might retire at a less sum than they would under the purchase system, because an officer has not paid anything out of his pocket. The retirement under the purchase system was a retirement from the service by sale, and thus received money.

410. Do you think that officers, we will say of 16 to 20 years' service, would retire for less than they obtained by selling out formerly under the purchase system?—Very likely they might.

411. (*Chairman.*) It is reasonable to suppose so, is it not, because under the purchase system they received partly their own money back again, whereas under any new system of retirement whatever they received would be all gain?—I think they might, and, therefore, there might be a lower scale of retirement.

412. I presume that the efficiency of such a scheme can only be tested by experience?—It is very difficult to say what amount will tempt a man to go.

413. What is your opinion with reference to a staff college? Do you think it is desirable to increase the facilities of attending the Staff College and getting certificates there?—No, I am not in favour of their being increased. I think that great changes might be made with regard to the system of entering the Staff College. At present going to the Staff College is voluntary. A man for some reason of his own says that he will go to the Staff College. It is not pure selection by the authorities.

414. Is there any evil in that, I mean in the fact that those who are anxious to improve themselves in military matters can go there? — Unfortunately that may be the plea, but I do not think it is the real reason. The reason constantly is, because it is more comfortable, and they are not knocked about. They do not want to go abroad, and they settle down comfortably at the Staff College for two years.

415. Do you think that that is the way in which it operates very much?—Very often it is.

416. In that respect some change perhaps ought to take place? Yes, that should be left entirely in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief.

417. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) It is not a matter of right with any officer who is willing to go into the Staff College. It is a favour which is granted to him?—It is a favour, but it has almost become a matter of course. An officer sends in his name, and says that he wishes to go to the Staff College, and if there is no regimental objection to it in consequence of other officers being employed otherwise on the staff, and there is a sufficient number of officers to perform the duties, the officer commanding has no objection to his going.

418. (*Lord Hampton.*) The commanding officer is obliged, is he not, to answer all questions relative to his efficiency; whether he is fit for his work, whether he has tact, and so on?—Yes, but practically we do not find that they are the best qualified.

419. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) There has to be a competitive examination previously, has there not, before he can go to the college?—Yes.

420. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is there much pressure to get into the college? Are there many applications?—Yes, their are always plenty of candidates for it.

421. (*Chairman.*) Therefore you would not increase that pressure?—No.

422. Do not you consider that the benefit obtained is considerable in those who go to it?—I should say yes, certainly, perhaps in the majority of cases; but there are a great number who come out of the Staff College who are by no means fit to be staff officers. In fact we sometimes get a report saying that an officer has passed all the tests perfectly well, and is qualified scholastically in every respect, but that he would never make a good staff officer.

423. Do you get such a report as that from the Staff College?—Yes, concerning his want of other qualifications. There are certain characteristics which are necessary in an officer, for instance, that he carries on business easily, and there are other attributes which are necessary. Some of them never become horsemen, in fact they have not those peculiar qualifications that an officer ought to possess, although they may be scholastically fit.

424. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Would it not be possible to combine admission to the Staff College with the confidential reports, so that admission to the Staff College might be held out as a reward to young officers who come out very favourably upon the report of the commanding officer?—Yes, that could be done.

425. (*Chairman.*) Would that remove the difficulty?—The best way would be for the commanding officer to be called upon to report specifically upon the personal qualifications of any particular officer whom he thought likely to become a useful staff officer.

426. And then if he was willing he might go to the college?—Yes.

427. (*Lord Hampton.*) How many officers does the Staff College hold?—About 40.

428. To what rank is the Staff College limited?—To captains and subalterns.

429. Are there none above captains?—No; there have been a few, but it is quite the exception. A field officer is qualified for the staff, and he may be placed upon the staff without having passed through the Staff College.

430. (*Chairman.*) What I understand you to feel is, that it is desirable that the commanding officer should select, not only men who are capable of going through the scholastic training in the college, but should select men who, when they have gone through that course, were likely to be qualified to become good staff officers, and that they alone should go to the Staff College, because afterwards you have got to make staff officers of them?—Quite so.

431. (*Lord Hampton.*) You think that it should be a system of selection and not a voluntary matter?—Quite so.

432. (*Chairman.*) Applying the same reasoning to the mode of entering the army by a competitive examination, do you think that that is a desirable method to be continued? — I do not think that we could do otherwise with the public.

433. Do you think that the present method of admitting men by competitive examination is one that secures to the State the best officers?—No, I do not.

434. I presume for the same reasons that you have already given with reference to examinations?—Yes, we have constantly a very fine young man who is just the sort of man that you would like to have in a regiment to make an officer of, but he is not of a scholastic turn at all, and he will not even compete.

435. Or if he does compete he does so not successfully?—Very often; and if he does it is a mere matter of cramming.

436. Is it your opinion that the services of many good men are lost continually to the State by the system of competitive examination?—Yes, I think so; fine active young men who are just the sort of stuff that you require for officers will not take the trouble, or perhaps they undergo a long course of cramming which is very distasteful the whole time, and not only that but they almost make a point of forgetting it; we had a most extraordinary case on one occasion. After the men had gone through all their qualifications and tests, they had a regular military funeral of all their books and they burnt and buried them.

437. I understand you to think that the system tends, first to exclude good men, and secondly that those who come in upon the score of having achieved a considerable amount of scholastic learning, very often forget it owing to the system of cramming?—It is often the case. I think it is very much owing to their cramming for a particular purpose that they are indifferent as to retaining it.

438. Nevertheless, you would think that it was desirable, would you not, to require a test examination on entrance to the army?—Yes, certainly.

439. There is one other subject which has engaged the attention of the Commission, which is with reference to a scheme of retirement and promotion. We have been led to believe that possibly the most economical system for that purpose, and the most beneficial

Sir P. Airey, G.C.B.

13 April 1875.

in a money point of view to officers might be obtained, if a different organization was adopted in our army, and if we had a larger number of majors and a smaller number of captains; do you think that such a change would be desirable in a military point of view?—Practically I am in favour of the present system. It has been proposed to have two companies under a field officer; for instance, if a regiment is 800 strong to have four majors, each commanding two companies. I am in favor of having two majors in a regiment, a major commanding each wing under the lieutenant-colonel with the unit of the company instead of two companies. We have never too many officers on service, but generally the contrary. It has happened to the men of a regiment in action, that the officers have been killed or wounded, and the men have gone and attached themselves to any officer they could in order to be led. I think our men require particularly to be led and directed by officers in whom they place confidence. Therefore, I am in favor of the present organization. There can be no doubt that if you have a larger number of field officers, and a fewer number of junior officers, of course there is more promotion in the junior ranks; but then you keep filling up the bottle of field officers while the neck of it always remains as it is.

440. The neck being the lieutenant-colonels?—Yes, and you would still have the same difficulty in getting rid of the great mass of majors.

441. That is looking at it in a promotion point of view, but with regard to army organization and army efficiency, you think that, even if it were better for promotion to make the change, it would be still desirable to keep matters as they are?—That is my opinion. I would rather keep the company as it is, the four companies of each wing under the majors and the lieutenant-colonel commanding over all.

442. If the number of captains were reduced, and the number of field officers were increased, would the field officers be willing to do certain duties which now devolve upon the captains?—Certainly not. No superior officer should be called upon to perform subordinate duties.

443. Would that be difficult in the English army?—It would be very distasteful, and wrong on principle.

444. Would you get the duties done, do you think?—The duty might be done when it became a duty, but there are a great number of minor regimental duties which should be performed by subordinate officers, and which officers of the rank of field officers, I think, ought not to be asked to perform any more than in a social state you ask a head servant to perform some lower services.

445. That would be felt by the army, would it not?—Yes, there are certain things, such as visiting the barrack yard, the latrines, and the urinals, going into the barrack rooms, which are things which ought to be done by juniors.

446. And which would be cheerfully done by junior officers, but done with reluctance by men of the rank of field officers?—Yes, certainly.

447. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Have brevet field officers to perform those duties at the present time?—They have to perform, regimentally, the duty of captains, but nothing lower.

448. Although they are of the same army rank as regimental field officers?—Yes.

449. (*Chairman.*) I suppose that that is one of your objections to brevet?—That is one of my objections. If you have got a brevet lieutenant-colonel a captain of a company, he is performing all those subordinate duties, which I do not think right.

450. If it was desirable with reference to army organization to make this change, it would have a benefit in another direction, namely, that it would prevent the supersession of officers of the line by officers of the artillery and engineers, because there are a greater number of field officers, are there not, in the artillery than there are in the line?—Recently the captains of batteries have become substantive majors. The reason that that was done was that the artillery at that time were behind the level of promotion in the line, and therefore this measure was adopted in order to bring up the level, but it has created a great deal of dissatisfaction in the army generally, and I should hope that it would not be established as a rule, but should only be had recourse to where it was necessary. Where you find great inequality existing between the line and the artillery and the engineers then it might be necessary.

451. They have more field officers in the artillery, have they not, than in the line?—Yes, a great many.

452. Does not that lead to an inequality between the line and the artillery with regard to army rank?—It did not, because in fact they were behindhand. The organization of the artillery is different, they have no majors, a man went from being captain up to being lieutenant-colonel at once, and, although he might be a good way behindhand as captain, this one jump puts him very often, not only in that rank, but high in army rank, and the equality was kept in that way.

453. How does it occur to you that the matter might be best arranged so that there should be as a rule no supersession of the line by the artillery or *vice versâ*?—The only way that you could do it would be by having recourse occasionally to the same measure as that which was adopted with regard to the artillery.

454. You mean that whenever the level got down lower you would restore the level by a special action?—Yes.

455. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Was it not necessary to give brevet rank to about 200 captains of the line after the captains of artillery were made majors?—There was much dissatisfaction, so that it was necessary to have recourse to such a measure.

456. (*Chairman.*) First an act of grace was done to the artillery, and then a countervailing act of grace had to be done to the line to bring them up again?—Yes, in a measure.

457. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert*) And those officers who were made majors have had to perform the duties of captains have they not?—Yes. That has always been the practice in the service, the brevet-major, who is a regimental captain, performs all the captain's duties.

458. (*Mr. Welby.*) When an officer gets substantive rank who has had brevet rank, his rank dates, does it not, from the period of his brevet rank?—Yes, he gets his army rank directly he gets his brevet.

459. (*Chairman.*) And that fixes his army rank for ever?—Yes.

460. (*Lord Hampton.*) In connexion with this subject on which you have just favoured us with your opinion, I should like to ask you another question. You have been examined with regard to your opinion as to the increasing the number of field officers in connexion with a change of the unit in each regiment. What would your opinion be with respect to a proposal for increasing the unit and having either a double company in infantry or a squadron in the cavalry without a corresponding increase of rank, that is to say, in having as now each company in the command of a captain, and each troop in command of a captain; but of course the senior captain would command the double company or the squadron. What would be your opinion of that change in the organization?—I am in favour of both the troop and the company organization as it now exists. We have always considered it absolutely necessary that there should be three officers to every troop and every company, and that even now does not exist; we have not got it in either branch of the service.

461. When I was at the War Office there was a change made in the cavalry to the extent of having the squadron unit instead of the troop unit, and upon that occasion the number of subalterns was reduced so as to have five officers instead of six in each squadron; and although the troop unit has been re-established, and the old system has been reverted to, but the additional subaltern has not been added, do you think it

is desirable that he should be added ?—Yes, the proper number of officers is very essential.

462. I am right in the belief, am I not, that England is the only country in Europe in which, with regard to cavalry, the troop is the unit ?—I believe so.

463. In the foreign armies the squadron is the unit in every instance ?—I believe so.

464. Does that apply to the infantry of foreign armies; have they all the double company ?—The only army that I know of with a double company is the Prussian army.

465. You do not know how that is in France ?—I think they only have the company and small battalions. A French regiment consists of either two or three battalions.

466. In the early part of your examination you spoke of seniority tempered by selection, may I ask you whether practically it is not seniority tempered by rejection ?—It may be so.

467. I understand you to say that, if there is a report against an officer and you stop his promotion, you may call that selection, but it is in the wrong direction, and the cases in which by selection officers on the ground of merit are specially promoted, I take it, are very rarely ?—Yes; except on service.

468. We are now speaking of the peace establishment, practically is it ever done, is there any selection of a good officer ?—If the senior officer of his rank in a regiment is not fit for promotion, then it is positively selection. The Commander-in-Chief selects the best officer elsewhere.

469. (*Chairman.*) He does not take the next in the regiment ?—No; not for any rank.

470. (*Lord Hampton.*) That clearly is selection; but is that carried out in practice to any extent ?—If there is a company vacant and the senior lieutenant, for any reason, should not be promoted, the Commander-in-Chief makes the best selection that he can from another regiment.

471. Not from the same regiment ?—No.

472. With regard to those examinations, do I understand you, that they are carried out with strictness throughout the whole army every year. Is there every year an examination into the character and qualities of the different officers in every regiment ?—Yes, every year, and there is a special report annually.

473. And that report is made by the inspecting general ?—Yes. The commanding officer attends personally on the inspecting general, so as to give any additional oral information besides what he may have written down in his confidential report.

474. Has the inspecting general in those cases any means of knowledge or information beyond what the commanding officer gives him ?—Except what he may have observed himself, on occasions, during his command.

475. What opportunities has such an officer of observing ?—Very great. For instance, the last command I had was at Gibraltar and the officers of that force were more or less always under my observation. I was constantly seeing them. Every week at all events there were movements of troops, besides seeing the regiments at other times and inspecting the regiments, and I had the best possible means of finding out which officer was intelligent and really knew his duty.

476. In the case you mention of Gibraltar, I presume that you, being the officer in command, commanded a limited number of men in garrison, and were the inspecting officer ?—I commanded the garrison of 4 or 5,000 men.

477. Would you equally apply a system of this kind to a large body of troops ?—I think so. A general officer at home commanding a brigade has three regiments and those officers are all tolerably well known to him.

478. (*Chairman.*) Would the inspecting general be the general of the district in England ?—Yes, at Portsmouth or Manchester he would be the general commanding the district, but at Aldershot there would be a certain number of general officers commanding brigades.

479. But they would be on the spot constantly ?—Yes.

480. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do you mean in that case that each general officer commanding a brigade would be the inspecting officer for the regiments composing that brigade ?—Yes.

481. Then of course he might have a personal knowledge of the officers ?—Yes.

482. It is a new system, is it not, since purchase was done away with ?—No, but became rather a matter of routine during the existence of purchase. The questions were frequently answered, "yes" or "no," as a matter of course; but now it is quite on a new footing and much more critical. There has been a new phase introduced into it taken from the French confidential reports, which is reporting upon what they call in France the *avenant* of an officer, which is general bearing, his manner, and his characteristics. Very often, particularly in France, they say he is *grossier*, that is to say, he may be quite qualified in other respects, but not qualified to be put in command, from bad manner, &c.

483. You told us that in the case of a young officer of decided promise and ability, he is never promoted over the heads of officers in the same regiment ?—Not in the same regiment.

484. Does not that practically create very great difficulty in promoting such officers ?—No. If he is an officer of distinguished merit the Commander-in-Chief can put him elsewhere, or employ him upon the staff.

485. (*Chairman.*) Those would be the very men, as I understand you, that would be taken to fill a vacancy in any regiment where the senior officer of the regiment had been reported against ?—Yes.

486. (*Lord Hampton.*) Speaking of brevet, I understood you to completely condemn the system of brevet ?—No, that is further than I intended to go. It has its advantages, because it is at times desirable to give an officer rank when he has distinguished himself very much; still I think it is an inconvenient system.

487. At all events you think it is carried too far ?—Certainly it has been carried too far.

488. If I understand you rightly, on the whole, especially if any good substitute could be provided, you would gladly get rid of the system altogether ?—Yes.

489. By the three modes which you have indicated, namely, either by good service pay, or by occasional promotion according to circumstances, or by a decoration, it would not be difficult to devise a satisfactory substitute for the brevet system ?—I think that there might be a system devised that might work better; of course the Commander-in-Chief always having the power to promote substantively when occasion arose.

490. You stated with regard to the five years' rule, that it was a good power to possess. I inferred from those expressions on your part that you would not adopt it as the general practice of the army for every commander of a regiment to vacate his command at the end of five years ?—Exactly so; not as a rule.

491. And I think you went on to say that as a rule it was not good for the service ?—I think not.

492. In fact, under the existing warrant I apprehend you disapprove of it as a rule for the service ?—Yes.

493. Would you prefer that the command of a regiment should be an unlimited command ?—No, I should maintain the power that you could relieve an officer of his command without any invidiousness, but at the same time that the Commander-in-Chief ought to have power to keep him on as long as he thought it advantageous to the service and just to the officer.

494. Under the rule now as you describe it, I apprehend that practically in the case of good officers they would be continued at the head of their regiments ?—Yes, probably.

495. In cases where the five years' rule was put in practice, and an officer was deprived of his command, do not you think there would be a danger of its be-

Sir R. Airey, G.C.B.

13 April 1875.

coming an invidious exercise of power?—I do not think so, if it was laid down as a regulation and the officer knew it, he might expect it. An officer would know that he had not been well spoken of during the tenure of his command.

496. Was not that warrant adopted partly at least with the view of assisting promotion by its action?—I think very much so.

497. Would not the adoption of such a rule as you now suggest be a very serious impediment to the flow of promotion?—It would act in that way, but I think it would act advantageously for the service. Of course it stands to reason that if every officer at the end of five years must by a hard and fast rule go, there would be a much greater stream of promotion.

498. With regard to the Staff College, do you think that any advantage with respect to the efficiency of officers might be obtained by making it (whether you call it a staff college or not) rather more extensive, so as to enable officers, somewhat in the manner which is now adopted for the navy, to increase their professional knowledge by temporary study at such a college; have you ever considered that question at all?—I am not in favour of extending the Staff College. In my opinion it acts injuriously, by officers being long separated from their practical regimental duties, and especially because an outside officer may take up his studies privately, and present himself for examination without being attached to the Staff College, when, if he passes, and attains the necessary qualifications, he is equally eligible for staff employment.

499. From your answer, I think you understood me to refer to staff appointments?—No, to the Staff College.

500. The object of my question is to know whether you think it might be an advantage to the army for a certain number of officers to study their profession in a general military college?—I think that the Staff College as it is affords all those advantages, if officers go there. I think it would be opening a door to men availing themselves of that excuse or plea to avoid regimental or garrison duty, and become idle.

501. Might not this be obviated by a system of strict examination after a certain period of time in the military college?—If the object of a periodical examination is to see how they have employed their time, and the progress they have made, it is the Staff College again.

502. You do not think it desirable, with a view to encouraging efficiency in the officers, combined with some prospect of earlier promotion for those who are successful in such examination?—I think the means are sufficient at present. We have got the Staff College, and also the power to an officer to qualify by any other means he likes.

503. But the practice is, that no one goes to the Staff College except those who are aiming at staff appointments?—Yes, certainly; they are aiming at staff appointments.

504. I think I understood you to say that with a view of securing efficiency in staff officers you would rather that officers of merit should be selected to go to the college than that it should be a matter of volunteering on their part?—Yes.

505. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I understood you to say that when an officer was reported against in a regiment, and was superseded in consequence, you thought he ought at once to retire?—I said if he was reported more than once.

506. Practically, if promotion is to go on in the regiment, if such an officer remains he would stop the promotion in the regiment?—Yes, for a time.

507. Do you consider the present establishment of officers for a regiment or a battalion equal or in excess of what is necessary?—They are not sufficient for real service.

508. Particularly in India?—Particularly in India, and in all the colonies.

509. Where a certain number of officers are taken for the staff, particularly if the officers are not sufficiently numerous, ought not those officers to be seconded in their regiments?—My impression is that every officer who is taken away from his regimental duty ought to be seconded. We find the greatest of difficulty and the greatest embarrassment from their not being so. Our army is distributed all over the world and when officers get leave of absence a considerable time elapses before they rejoin again, during which time there is a great paucity of officers. Officers who may have very good reason for leave of absence, sometimes even on account of their health, and cannot be allowed to leave their regiments. I think that every officer who is employed away from his regimental duties ought to be seconded.

510. (*Chairman.*) When you say permanently employed you mean he if is employed for five years?—If he has got a regular staff appointment.

511. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) The objection to that I suppose is on the score of expense?—Yes.

512. (*Lord Hampton.*) Would not there be a difficulty in bringing him back on the expiration of his staff appointment?—An officer ought immediately upon the expiration of his staff appointment to be sent to join his regiment again for a time as supernumerary.

513. (*Chairman.*) The result of seconding is that you keep both officers?—Yes, for a time.

514. (*Lord Hampton.*) If he had been seconded there would be another officer in his place and at the expiration of his staff appointment he would return to his regiment?—Yes.

515. According to your opinion there are not officers enough at present to do the duty, so that that would not be an evil?—No, it would not.

The witness withdrew.

Sir C.H.Ellice, K.C.B.

Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Henry Ellice, K.C.B., examined.

516. (*Chairman.*) You are quarter-master general of the army, are you not?—Yes.

517. The first question that the Commission have been discussing is with regard to the general system in which promotion in the army should go, whether it should go by seniority or to what extent it should be tempered by selection—at present since the abolition of purchase the Commander-in-Chief has the absolute power of filling up every vacancy by selection, has he not?—Yes. I should think that as a rule promotion ought to be by regimental seniority with selection in very special cases; because, during the dead level of peace, there are not sufficient data for the exercise of so invidious a discrimination as selection. The utmost extent to which selection should be exercised during peace, in my opinion is, first, through the exercise of the veto now possessed by the Commander-in-Chief through confidential reports against the promotion of officers palpably unfit; and, secondly, in the case where the senior officer of any regimental grade may have served too short a time to justify his promotion to a vacancy in the grade next higher. I do not think it is possible to select in time of peace beyond that.

518. In order to select in time of peace, you consider that a comparison of the regimental reports of every officer in the service in the same grade would be necessary?—Yes.

519. And that it would be necessary to attempt to strike a balance between the merits of different officers founded upon those reports?—Yes.

520. And that would not be practicable, you think?—No. I think that the confidential reports simply state whether an officer is fit or unfit, efficient or inefficient.

521. They state a good deal more than that, do

they not?—Yes; but still I think that a confidential report ought to be taken in that way, that an officer ought to be promoted as long as he is efficient.

522. You would use the confidential report as a means of enabling you to reject, but not as a means of ascertaining comparative merit, so as to promote entirely by selection?—Precisely so.

523. Do you attach any great importance to the fact that under the system of regimental seniority there would obviosuly be great inequalities in the rapidity of promotion in different regiments, is that a thing which it is important to avoid? — No, I think not. I do not think it is very unequal. The inequality that formerly existed was chiefly owing to the purchase system.

524. There would be naturally an inequality, owing to deaths, would there not?—Yes, of course; but I think that that would find its own level one year with another.

525. The effect of it is that it tends to bring forward some officers earlier than usual?—I think that the regimental system has always done that.

526. And you do not see any evil in it?—None whatever.

527. The system of confidential reports has been very much improved and extended, since the abolition of purchase has it not?—That is a thing which I cannot answer; I believe they are thoroughly to be replied upon.

528. Those reports do not come under your cognizance?—No; they are under the Military Secretary. I might see them, but as a rule I do not.

529. Do you attach any importance to promotion being so arranged, that a man should arrive at the rank of a field officer at a tolerably early age?—Certainly; it is always better to have them young.

530. About what age on an average should you say that a man ought to become a field officer, or ought to have the command of a regiment, with the view to the efficiency of the army?—It is a very difficult question to answer, because one man is more efficient when he is 60 than another man is at 40. I do not think that you need have any limit of age, so long as a man is thoroughly efficient, and professionally fit.

531. If you were contriving a scheme of promotion, and thereby regulating the rapidity with which a man would arrive at the rank of field-officer, looking to the efficiency of the service, what is the period that you would fix upon, as being a desirable period at which a man should arrive at the rank of commander of a regiment?—30 years' service I should suppose; but as I said before, so long as a man is professionally fit, I would not have a limit of age.

532. What would be your opinion with reference to field officers generally. Would you allow a captain of any age to go on and become a major?—No; I should say the same of him. I should limit him to 30 years, when he must retire at once if he is not promoted.

533. Would you place a limit of 30 years on a captain before he became a major?—A lieutenant-colonel now at 60 years of age can be retired, and I suppose if a major's limit is 30 years' service, you might put a captain at less. If it a question of retirement compulsorily, that is quite another matter.

534. I meant it to be the same question, because supposing that you were contriving a scheme of retirement, you would have to look and see at how late an age you think a man ought to be allowed to obtain his rank?—As long as he is professionally fit, because his being professionally fit means, that he is in full vigour of mind and body, and is fit for anything as a commanding officer or a general officer.

535. Do I gather it as your opinion that if a man is in the position of captain and has had 30 years' service if he has not got promotion he should be compulsorily retired? — I think that if he should be compulsorily retired he should get a good retirement, and if you want to give promotion you might fix it at an earlier year.

536. At what age would you say?—You might put it at 25 years' service.

537. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster*). What would you consider an ample retirement?—I should consider that it would be the same money which a man was receiving, together with an allowance in lieu of his quarters, his fuel and light, and his military servant.

538. (*Chairman*). That is to say a pension equal to his then position?—Yes, exactly so; equal to his pay and allowances.

539. Is that the only method that occurs to your mind besides that which is now adopted of the Commander-in-Chief acting upon those confidential reports, by which meritorious officers could be pressed forward in regimental position?—In my opinion it is impossible in peace time to select officers as deserving promotion over the heads of other officers. Any such selection can only be made from officers who have proved their efficiency in the field.

540. And even as regards those I presume you would not promote them over the heads of men in their own regiment?—No; I think not, generally. I suppose they would get substantive promotion out of the regiment and be brought in again.

541. It would be an invidious thing, would it not, to promote a man in his own regiment over the heads of those who were his seniors, however much he might have distinguished himself?—Yes.

542. Would you continue the system of regimental seniority throughout the regiment, right up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel?—Yes, I would.

543. Have you any decided opinion on the question of brevet promotion as to whether it is a desirable system or not?—Yes; I think it is desirable.

544. Is it a system which you think desirable to be retained?—Yes; I think that the benefit to be derived from brevet promotion is that it is a means of bringing on young officers who may have proved themselves thoroughly efficient in the field.

545. Does any other method occur to you by which the same end might be achieved?—No.

546. But brevet has its evils, has it not?—It has evils, no doubt.

547. We have been told that it interferes somewhat with the performance of regimental duties by placing a man who is a brevet colonel into the position of a captain in his regiment which sometimes occurs?—I do not believe that any practical interference has ever been occasioned by the system so far as that is concerned.

548. You do not think that there is any practical evil to be removed in that direction?—No; I think that brevet has been carried too far, certainly.

549. You think that brevet rank has been too freely bestowed?—Yes; I think so.

550. What in your opinion would be the proper corrective for that?—Resisting pressure and being more sparing in bestowing it.

551. That is somewhat difficult, is it not?—Yes; but I think it is the only way.

552. In the case of active operations in the field when men are reported by their general officers as having distinguished themselves and having achieved great success, there ought to be some means, ought there not, of rewarding a man of whom such a report is made?—In the case of a man who has thoroughly distinguished himself, and proved himself remarkably efficient, he most certainly should be promoted, but not otherwise.

553. (*Lord Hampton.*) You think that promotion by brevet should be the exception and not the rule?—Yes.

554. (*Chairman.*) It is not merely that brevet, as you would consider, is too freely bestowed, but you would say that the right system would be not to reward so generally, but to make the reward the exception?—Yes, not to give it out broadcast.

555. With reference to promotion and the retirement that is necessary to create promotion, there is a rule existing that field officers are to hold their commission for five years, do you think that this is

Sir C.H.Ellice, K.C.B.

3 April 1875.

desirable?—I think that you might leave the five years as the rule, but also allow that an officer should be kept in command of a regiment so long as he is thoroughly efficient.

556. Do you say that, looking at the question from the point of view of military efficiency?—Yes.

557. What do you say looking at it from the point of promotion, because if you retain an officer in his position at the head of a regiment for a long time, you stop promotion, do you not?—I suppose you do, but then that is a question of retirement. I say that if you give a good retirement, you will get promotion.

558. Is it your opinion that you might adhere to the five years' rule with rigidity if at the end of the five years you gave a good retirement?—No. I should never remove officers as a rule. I should let them remain in command of a regiment so long as they proved themselves thoroughly efficient.

559. Where would you get your promotion from in such a case?—I think if there were a good retirement men would take it and you would get promotion in that way, but I would not force them to take it.

560. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You think that a voluntary retirement with a good retiring pension and allowances would produce a sufficient number of vacancies to get promotion?—Yes. It is a hard case if an officer who, by getting his promotion early, obtains command of a regiment, should, by the operation of the five years' rule, be placed on the staff in the prime of life. One Commander-in-Chief having the power to remove an officer at five years, if he thinks fit, can always help on the thoroughly efficient ones, and get rid of those who are not so.

561. (*Chairman.*) Then the system which you would advocate, as I understand, would be this, you would retain the five years' rule as a means, without invidiousness, of removing from command a man who was not signally fit for it?—Yes.

562. But you would not act rigidly upon the five years' rule, but allow any efficient officer to remain in command?—Yes, certainly.

563. And you would for the purposes of promotion invite a sufficient number of men to retire from their command by giving them an adequate pension?—Yes, certainly.

564. You agree that it is a bad thing that a lieutenant-colonel removed from the command of his regiment should remain on half pay until in the ordinary course of life he becomes a major-general?—Yes, certainly. I think it is bad for himself and bad for the service; he must get rusty.

565. One cure which has been suggested to the Commission for that has been to increase the fixed establishment of general officers which of course would relieve the half-pay list to a certain extent; what do you say as to that?—I see no objection to it.

566. What would be the amount of retirement that you would offer to a person in the position of a lieutenant-colonel?—In my opinion there is but one answer to that question, and that is that any pension that is offered must be the same in all branches of the service of the same rank. At present the scale for the Royal Engineers and the Royal Artillery is not successful as many lapse every year, and a lower scale would not probably be acceptable to the officers of the line.

567. Their scale is 600*l.* a year, is it not?—Yes, after 40 years' service for colonels.

568. (*Maj. Gen. Foster.*) That is the new rule; every officer who was in the Artillery two or three years ago is entitled to 600*l.* a year after 30 years' service?—No, I think it is exactly as I said before, The pay and allowances of a colonel of a regiment came to very nearly 600*l.* a year. He has got his 1*l.* a day, he has got his forage for two horses, his quarters, his fuel and light, and he has no taxes to pay, and of course it is very much cheaper to live at the mess than anywhere else.

569. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Altogether you put it at about 600*l.* a year?—I will not be sure, but I should think it is nearly that.

570. (*Chairman.*) Do you agree that it would be a desirable thing to offer an inducement by way of pension or a lump sum of money to the officers in the lower ranks of the army with the view of creating promotion?—No, I do not think it is desirable. In my opinion, by such a system, you would lose the best officers and keep the worst. For instance, a clever and able man, not seeing much chance of early promotion or active service, and with small means of his own, might supplement it by the grant from the Government and double it by his own exertions in the city or in any other place, whereas a man who is not so clever or is indolent, knowing that he could not depend upon his own exertions for the increase of his income, would remain in the army.

571. You are aware, are you not, that under the purchase system the number that went out of the lower ranks was very large indeed?—Yes, my idea is that if you give a man a lump sum the man who has got brains and wants to increase his income will take that sum and will go away. Your able men will go, but your less able men will stop.

572. When you bring it to the test, if that is the correct view of what is likely to happen, that would have happened under the purchase system, would it not, because it offered just the same inducement; there were the means then of retiring and getting a lump sum of money at any period?—Of getting only his own money.

573. Sometimes his own and sometimes only part of it; his own, and sometimes none of it his own?—Mostly his own, I should think.

574. It was about two-thirds purchase money and one-third non-purchase?—I mean it was as a rule, a sum of money which he had previously paid.

575. Sometimes if he got a non-purchase commission it would be none of his own money?—I think it was the rule for the people who left to have purchased their commission.

576. There was a strong inducement to go, and that ought, ought it not, to have the same effect as you anticipate?—I do not think you can quite argue the two questions together, because under the purchase system a man might be a monied man. We want men with brains and less money. Very often those who left after being a short time in the service were men with money, who had come into the service just to amuse themselves for a few years.

577. Would not that class do the same now?—Yes, but I think they would go under any circumstances without any inducement of that sort.

578. Still I suppose it would be the case very often that a man who was willing to go and wished to go would not be able to go unless he had some small sum of money to take with him?—No; but still I think you would get rid of your best men, and keep your worst, under that system.

579. But the alternative of that system would be to create a much more rapid flow to the upper branches; and if you do not remove the lieutenant-colonels, but keep them in command of their regiments, and do not offer any inducements to men to go in the lower ranks, how would you get your promotion?—I think if you give inducements to men in the higher ranks, they would go, and you would get your promotion in that way.

580. Would you say that the best mode of approaching the question would be to give larger inducements in the upper ranks?—Yes.

581. What do you say with regard to compulsory retirement? Would you retire compulsorily in any rank? and if so, in what rank, supposing you do not get a sufficient flow of promotion?—A compulsory retirement, if it is absolutely necessary to the service, must be adopted, I suppose; and the only way of carrying it out would be to give a considerable retirement.

582. A considerable retirement when you bring it to bear?—Yes.

583. But you would not resort to it unless absolutely necessary?—No, I would not.

584. Have you any experience of the class of men that come into the army now as compared with those who used to come in before the new system, before purchase was done away with?—I believe they are pretty much the same.

585. Our experience has not been long enough to enable you to form a clear opinion about it?—No: the new system has not been in operation sufficiently long, I think.

586. What do you say on the subject of staff appointments, do you think it is for the good of the service that they should be confined to a limited class, that is to say, that men who have obtained experience on the staff should be reappointed, or do you think it better that after five years' service as a staff officer someone else should be appointed in his place?—I think five years should be the rule, subject to exceptions and the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief in very special cases.

587. As a rule you would spread those appointments over the army?—Yes, I think as a rule a man ought always to go back to regimental duty after his five years.

588. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) How would you propose that a field officer should go back to his regimental duties?—If there is a vacancy I would send him back as a field officer.

589. (*Chairman.*) I presume he would have to go on half pay till that time, till there was an opportunity found to bring him in on full pay?—Yes.

590. Something was said the other day, I think, by the Commander-in-Chief about the desirability of giving civil posts or positions in the Control Department as a means of procuring retirement, and thereby promotion; do you think that that is a feasible plan?—Yes, I think so.

591. Do you think that it would be effective, and that it would be an object of ambition to the men?—In some ranks it would.

592. Would it be effective?—I think it would if for every five promotions in each grade of the Control one should be given to the line.

593. That would be a very small number, would it not?—It would be a commencement. I think also that it would be a good thing if paymasters were selected from officers of the army.

594. Their position is such that it would be very reasonable to fill them from the line?—Yes, as was always the case. It is only of late years that it has been stopped. When I joined the service it was always the case.

595. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Where do they take the paymasters then now from?—The Secretary of State appoints them under the advice of the Accountant-General.

596. (*Chairman.*) Have you any other suggestion to make to the Commission?—There is one suggestion which I would make, it is this, that after 40 years' service every general officer should have the option of being placed on a non-effective list at a rate of increased annual pay, thereby foregoing his claim to an honorary colonelcy.

597. Your proposal would be that a general officer, after a certain number of years, say 40 years' service, should be at liberty at his option to place himself on a retired list?—Yes.

598. And that the effect of his doing so should be that on the one hand he would receive larger pay, and on the other hand would forfeit all claim to an honorary colonelcy?—Yes, quite so.

599. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Would you fill that vacancy up by the promotion of a colonel in his place?—I suppose the fixed establishment would be the same.

600. (*Chairman.*) You are not speaking of adding to the fixed establishment, but of dividing it in that way, the division really consisting in his giving up the claim to the honorary colonelcy and thereby obtaining larger pay?—Yes.

601. (*Lord Hampton.*) Would you give him a step in rank?—No, I think not.

602. (*Chairman.*) The number of field officers in the artillery is much greater than in the line. Would it be desirable in your opinion to equalise the number of field officers in the different branches of the service?—I think it might.

603. And that is to be done by increasing the number in the line, is it not?—Either by increasing the number in the line, or decreasing the number in the Artillery.

604. You think it is desirable that they should be the same, but what would be the best way of doing it? Would it be best to decrease the Artillery or to increase the line?—I am not sure. I do not see any objection to increasing the majors in the line, but on one condition only, and that is that the number of companies' officers are in no way diminished.

605. But you would add to the whole strength of the officers in the regiment?—I do not think you can do with less company officers than you have got.

606. You say, as I understand, that you would increase the number of majors, but you would not decrease the number of captains?—I would increase the majors, but I would not decrease the company officers,

607. But then you would add to the whole number of officers in the regiment?—Yes.

608. (*Lord Hampton.*) With what view do you increase the majors? Is it with a view merely to increase the strength of the field officers, or with a view to their taking any command of companies or squadrons?—I prefer the present company system; but if it is found necessary to give more majors, you must form double companies.

609. Do I understand you rightly that that you would like to see the strength of field officers, at any rate in their regiments, increased?—Yes, I should like that, simply to bring about an equality with the artillery and engineers.

610. But if done, and you wish to see it done, would it be merely increasing the field officers of the regiment, or would it be with the view to their command over double companies?—If you increase the majors, you must have double companies in my opinion.

611. And in the cavalry the squadrons?—Yes.

612. Irrespective of any comparison with the artillery, do you approve of the system which is general abroad, I believe, of double companies and two troops forming one unit as a squadron?—Of course I have never had an opportunity of seeing that worked; but, as I said before, I prefer our present system, because it has always worked admirably.

613. You approve of it as a positive good, and not by way of comparison?—Just so.

614. You are aware of the fact, I presume, that that system does not obtain abroad in foreign armies?—Quite so.

615. With regard to brevet, you think it is carried too far, but you would not do away with the system. Is that your view?—Yes.

616. And you are not prepared to offer any opinion with regard to an alternative system which might be substituted for brevet; that is to say, an alternative mode of rewarding service?—No.

617. With regard to the five years' rule, I undertand you to express a decided opinion that you would keep an officer in command of a regiment as long as he was efficient, and I think you went on to say that you think it hard upon an efficient colonel to be deprived of his command?—Yes.

618. Would not it be equally hard upon the next officer in the regiment to be deprived of his succession?—No, I think not.

619. You think that he must take his chance?—Yes.

620. Would not you be afraid of some danger to the flow of promotion if officers were to act as stoppers in that way at the head of a regiment?—I think, as I said before, that with a good retirement you would get a flow of promotion.

Sir C. H. Ellice, K.G.B.

13 April 1875.

621. You think that that would be a sufficient inducement to officers to give up their command ?—Yes.

622. (*Chairman.*) Probably the hardship would vanish if you were to give a compulsory retirement or an optional retirement, even at the end of five years of a sufficiently liberal character ?—Yes.

623. Do you agree that if an officer is appointed to a staff appointment it is desirable that he should be seconded in his regiment ?—Certainly.

624. So as to keep up the strength of the officers in the regiment ?—Yes, I think it is essential.

625. Do you think that the present number of officers is more than sufficient ?—No.

626. Is it enough ?—There should be three officers to a company in England, and four in India.

627. (*Lord Hampton.*) The present cavalry organisation is less than that, is it not ?—Yes, it is less than that.

628. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) I think you stated that it was necessary to remove staff officers every five years in order that the advantages might be equalized, and that a number of officers might gain experience ; is not the same thing applicable to the command of regiments ?—I said that it was advisable that should be the rule, subject to the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief, that is, the Commander-in-Chief could always keep on a good staff officer, the same as a good commanding officer.

629. Do you think that the regimental officers should be removed every five years in the same way as the staff officers ?—No.

630. (*Chairman.*) You say that you think it is a good thing to apply the five years' rule to staff appointments ?—Yes.

631. And amongst other reasons because it diffuses over the army generally an opportunity of holding those appointments ?—Yes; and not only that, but a staff officer ought not to be always all his life on the staff ; he wants his experience as a regimental officer as well. The staff is not entirely composed of officers of the higher grades ; there are a great number of officers of junior rank so employed. Officers to be thoroughly efficient should have experience in regimental duty in every rank.

632. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Was not the Commander-in-Chief allowed during the purchase system to promote a certain number of officers by purchase to unattached rank, and did not those officers go over the heads of their comrades ?—I do not know that.

633. (*Chairman.*) Under the purchase system the Commander-in-Chief was able, was he not, to allow a man to buy unattached promotion ?—Yes.

634. The effect of which was that he obtained a higher grade in the army and was capable of exchanging with some other officer into substantive rank and actual service in the regiment in that higher grade ?—Yes, I believe so.

635. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Does not the same rule exist at present that an officer can now obtain a step of substantive rank, only without purchase, and having taken that step of substantive rank, the Commander-in-Chief can place him on full pay with a new rank in any regiment he chooses ?—I believe the case of all those officers that got selected was that they very seldom got on full pay again. Whether they went over the heads of their comrades I do not know. I do not know how the Commander-in-Chief selected.

636. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Are you aware that there are several regiments since the Crimea in which not a single officer has died, and that in other regiments there have been about 20 deaths in the same period ?—That may be ; I have no means of knowing it.

637. Would not that make immense inequality in the promotion ?—It would, of course, but, as I said before, it always finds its own level in time. One regiment is lucky one year and another another year.

638. Do you consider the regiment a sufficiently large unit for promotion by seniority ?—Certainly ; the regiment should be the unit as tending to keep up the regimental system.

The witness withdrew.

Major-General Sir Alfred H. Horsford, K.C.B., examined.

Sir A. H. Horsford, K.C.B.

639. (*Chairman.*) I think you hold the position of military secretary ?—Yes.

640. As military secretary you must have under your attention from time to time the confidential reports that are made ?—The new confidential reports ? There are two kinds of confidential reports, there is the confidential report that goes to the adjutant-general, which also enters into the behaviour of officers and the discipline of the regiment, and there is also the confidential report on a single sheet which comes up to the military secretary, the report from the commanding officer, certified by the general officer upon the conduct of each officer ; this is annual report and kept posted up against the name of every officer. Each officer has got a separate book, and whenever it becomes necessary these books can be appealed to. This has not been in force more than about three or four years, and therefore it would be of more use some years hence than it is at present. It would then be ascertained whether the general officers were of the same opinion.

641. On the other hand, as time goes on, you may improve the form in which it is carried out ?—I hardly think we could. It is a very good one indeed, it gives every information that you ought to have, only it has not been long enough at work.

642. Do you agree in what has been said, that it is desirable that on making those reports the commanding officer should tell any officer against whom he has made an unfavourable report that he has so reported ?—Yes, I think on the whole it is certainly better that he should do so.

643. It would be the less evil of the two ?—Yes, certainly. It prevents anything like the possibility of his being stabbed in the back, or its being supposed that he was.

644. The mode in which this confidential report is acted upon is chiefly in what I may call a negative way, is it not ; that is to say, it operates chiefly by way of rejection for promotion rather than selection for promotion out of a man's turn ?—If a man is spoken very highly of he might be promoted out of his turn, but as a rule if he is reported on favourably and happens to be senior officer, he generally gets his promotion.

645. Therefore in practice the rule is one of promotion by seniority in the regiment, unless there is a sufficient case against him ?—Unless there is a report against him, but there must also be a report in his favour, it must say that he is fit for promotion. The words are entered that he is fit for promotion, and is recommended for it. Under those circumstances he is not passed over if he happens to be of sufficient standing in the regiment.

646. That is to say, owing to the number of deaths, or any exceptional cause of promotion going on too rapidly in a regiment so as to bring forward a man who has a very small number of years' service, you do not necessarily give him a step ?—He does not as a necessity get the step as it may be found that he wants more experience and the commander-in-chief might appoint another man.

647. Does that often happen ?—I have not been long enough in office to have seen many of these cases.

648. How long have you been in office ?—Since October last. Between that time and now I have had several cases where an officer has not been con-

sidered of sufficient experience to be promoted to the rank which has become vacant, an officer has been brought in from half-pay, or even from another regiment where there has been no promotion.

649. That system all tends to redress the inequality of promotion which would otherwise take place under the system of regimental promotion ?—There must be inequalities, but it tends towards equalizing.

650. Upon the whole do you think that promotion by seniority in the regiment, subject to that qualification, is a desirable method ?—I think so.

651. Better than promotion by seniority in the army at large ?—Yes.

652. Then promotion by seniority in the regiment is necessary you think to maintain the regimental system ?—I think so. I think it would be the most satisfactory in the army.

653. With regard to distinguished service conduct and good conduct in the field, the present system of rewarding such conduct is brevet is it not ?—Yes, it has been so.

654. But we are told that that has been somewhat too lavishly exercised, do you agree with that ?—I think it has been so lately.

655. Do you think that the system itself is one deserving reprobation or not ?—I see no other way.

656. From your answer I imply that there are some things in brevet that you would get rid of if you could ?—It chokes the upper ranks, but then I do not see what other remedy you could suggest.

657. Do you lay any great stress upon the circumstance that brevet rank places a man of superior rank in the army in a lower rank in his regiment and then allows him to remain so, and thus he has to do the duties of a man who is his junior in the army, is that an evil of any great magnitude ?—No. I have sometimes seen disagreeable things occur but they are uncommon. I have seen a captain who may be a brevet-major in a position where he has perhaps had a little mixed command, and he becomes senior to the actual major of the regiment, and takes the command when the force is mixed. This is rare, but it does occur.

658. Do you think that the chief evil of brevet is the lavish way in which it has been bestowed ?—I think so.

659. Would you provide any substitute in that respect for brevet or would you fall back upon the idea that rewards are not necessary except for some very distinguished or signal service ?—I think it is a reward that must be given, and I know of no other way of giving it but by brevet.

660. At present, as I understand, the system rather is this, that officers who are reported by their commanding officers after active service as having done well naturally look to a brevet step ?—They are recommended, and very often a great deal of pressure is put on.

661. You would not interfere with the system itself ?—I do not think you can alter the system. It must entirely depend upon the circumstances of each case.

662. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is it left entirely to the discretion of the generals in the field to say who shall or who shall not be recommended, is there no restriction put upon them ?—Nobody is ever promoted unless recommended, but it does not follow that all those recommended are promoted.

663. But there is no restriction or advice given to a commanding officer to limit the number of officers that he recommends ?—No.

664. Could not that be done for the good of the service ?—I hardly see how.

665. (*Chairman.*) Might not the same end to some extent be achieved by unattached promotion being given, or would that involve expense upon the half-pay list ?—It would involve expense and after you have given unattached promotion you would find difficulty in bringing an officer back again into a regiment.

666. What is your opinion with regard to the half-pay list ; is the half-pay system a desirable system ?—It is a necessary one, you could not do without it ; the smaller you can make it and the more you diminish it the better, but it is something that you must fall back upon and have always ready at hand. But, as I have said, if you promote a man to unattached rank you always have a point of difficulty in getting him man into a regiment again, because otherwise he would stand in the way of those who consider it their birthright to be promoted, and he may therefore have to wait for years before he can return to full pay.

667. To whatever extent they are brought in that *pro tanto* stops the regimental promotion ?—Yes, it does In fact every time they are brought they stop promotion.

668. On the subject of promotion what do you say about the rule of lieutenant-colonels holding command for five years, do you think that that is a rule which should be always acted upon with a view of creating promotion below ?—I think not. I think that it is a rule which ought always to be retained in the event of its being required, but if an officer shows himself active and efficient I think it would be a pity to remove him.

669. That is looking at it from the point of view of military efficiency, but looking at from the point of view of the officers, our rights and feelings and so forth, and looking at it from the points of promotion with the view of creating promotion to those below, what should you say ?—There is no doubt that it would help very largely.

670. In that point of view supposing that such a system as that were adhered to of removing a lieutenant-colonel after five years' command of his regiment, if with that system there was coupled a liberal retirement for the lieutenant-colonel if he liked to avail himself of it, do you think that that would be a good plan ?—That seems to me the only way that it could be arranged ; if you do not compensate an officer he would feel that his promotion was almost leading him to the end of his career. I know myself that a captain, very high up in the list, has come to me actually in fear that he may be promoted and that there was a possibility that this five years' rule might be carried out amongst the majors also, which I hope it may not be, but he said if it happens to me, a poor man with a family to support, I shall be thrown upon the wide world at the end of five years, and I should prefer remaining as a captain on full pay as there is no such rule for captains.

671. If I understand the proposition rightly what you say is this, that there is now no five years' rule as applied to majors, but that the effect of a man becoming a major under the five years' rule, if it is ridigidly applied to them, would be that at the end of five years he would be put upon the half pay of a major without any reasonable prospect of further employment, and that the half pay of a major would be a worse position than the full pay of a captain, is that what you wish to convey ?—Yes. The rule does exist, but I hope may not be acted on.

672. And it was some communication of that nature that you were speaking of this morning ?—Yes, and if placed on a long list of half pay majors the difficulty of bringing him in to serve would almost amount to the loss of his profession.

673. In a pecuniary point of view he is in a worse condition than if he remained a captain ?—Yes, certainly.

674. Therefore, you think that the five years' rule could not be applied to majors unless it were accompanied with some more adequate retirement after five years ?—An adequate retirement might be an inducement, but after all if you do give him this retirement you make him give up all hopes of getting on in the army. You give him money, but you do not give him perhaps what he looks to more than anything else, advancement in his profession, and you may besides lose good men.

675. As applied to lieutenant-colonels you say it is destroying a man's position and his prospects and hopes to say that he must retire at the end of five years. Do you know at all what the average number of years was under the purchase system that a lieutenant-colonel held his commission ?—No, I cannot.

676. Would you be surprised if you were told that

Sir A. H. Horsford, K.C.B.

13 April 1875.

it was only about 6 or 7½ years on the average?—I should. It is a very difficult thing to draw the line with respect to age. One man may be perfectly fitted for service at 60, whilst another is perfectly worn out at 50, and very often earlier.

677. Still it would be desirable, I suppose, to have field officers as young as may be?—Yes.

678. If you were contriving a scheme of promotion what age would you aim at as the average age at which a man should take the command of a regiment, speaking now of course of the efficiency of the service?—He ought to be fit at 30, and might also be still fit at 50.

679. Would 50 be too old for him to take command of a regiment as a rule to begin with; or what period would you fix upon at which you would say it would be desirable for a man to begin?—I would rather not go beyond 50.

680. If he took command five years before that he would be 45?—Yes; but that would be very hard upon a great many men who are now older than that and who would be excluded.

681. Do you mean that you would rather that he did not receive a command before that?—I see no reason why he should not get a command earlier.

682. If things were arranged as you were suggesting, namely, that the five years' rule should not be applied to a major, and should not be applied with anything like a general application to lieutenant-colonels or to either rank, in that state of things how would you procure promotion to the lower ranks?—There is but one way, and that is by granting such an inducement as would be sufficient for an officer to leave his command, I mean that there should be no loss to an officer by retiring.

683. Would you offer that inducement to the various ranks, or only to the upper ranks?—Certainly it would be more useful to the upper ranks, because that of itself would carry promotions; but it would perhaps be necessary to offer it to other ranks although there are a great many who would not take it.

684. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In the case of the captain that you mentioned who did not wish to become a major, if he had been offered a retiring allowance equal to his pay and his allowances he would have been only too glad to have gone at once?—In that instance yes; but a great many would not like to give up their profession.

685. (*Chairman.*) Still there are a vast number who although they may have liked to enter the army are not attached to their profession?—Yes.

686. And who would be very willing to go if they could?—Yes. I think if there were a fair amount offered there would be a great many who would take it.

687. If they had a private fortune, or in the position in which they were placed they were desiring to marry, and other considerations of that kind?—Yes, or family men who cannot afford to move about with their regiments. Those are the officers who feel the pressure when their regiment moves about a great deal; it is a question of expense. For that reason many men would go to depôt brigades; but there is no great temptation in the position excepting that they have not the expense of moving about.

688. A great many men enter the army without any fixed desire to go through with it, men who anticipate coming into some property which happens to them after some number of years, and they are very willing to go, and if any inducement were offered they would be glad to accept it?—Yes.

689. With regard to the establishment of general officers it has been suggested that a retired list might be formed of those who liked to give up their chance of an honorary colonelcy, or that even without giving up that chance, a retired list might be formed; and one suggestion has been made to the Commission that under those circumstances the number might be added to as a means of providing for lieutenant-colonels who ceased to command a regiment; are you able to express any opinion upon that suggestion?—There certainly could be no harm in having two sets of general officers, one on the active list and another on the retired list, who would be aware that they are not to expect employment.

690. Do you see any great benefit to be achieved by any alteration of that kind?—It would allow you to make more generals, and by making more generals it would help the promotion.

691. It would be an additional expense of course, but you think it would be one way of applying money to create promotion?—Yes.

692. On the other hand, a reasonably liberal retiring pension might be given to a lieutenant-colonel if he chose to accept it, not compulsorily but voluntarily?—I should be very glad indeed to see that brought forward. I am sure it would do good. I think a great many of them would accept it.

693. Just as a great many sold out under the old purchase system, soon after they had got their lieutenant-colonelcy?—Yes. I think it would get rid of the stagnation that most likely there would be otherwise.

694. There is considerable stagnation, is there not, always under the rank of major-general, that is to say, stagnation in the sense of men being out on half-pay sometimes for years before they can get on to the fixed establishment?—A great many.

695. That is a bad thing is it not?—It is a bad thing, but it is not to be remedied under the present system. I do not know what else you could propose.

696. If you increased the number of the fixed establishment that would relieve it, would it not, to some extent?—Yes, but at additional expense

697. So again if you offered a retiring pension that would relieve it?—Yes.

698. It would clear the half-pay list *pro tanto*?—Yes.

699. Has the class of officers that have come in under the system of competitive examination since the purchase system was abolished come under your particular notice in any way, so as to enable you to afford the Commission any information as to whether they are the same, or different from the class that came in before?—I have been in command at Malta, and I have had the command of south-eastern district latterly, and I have asked all the commanding officers upon the subject, which is the best way to get information, and I have not heard on the whole anything against them; and from what I have seen I must say that I cannot remark any alteration in the class of officers. Whether it is that the regime is so good in regiments that they have fallen into it at once I do not know. At first I acknowledge that I did not expect that it would be so, and I was prepared to find a difference, but I cannot say that I have seen it.

700. Of course it has only been a short time in operation?—No.

701. (*Lord Hampton.*) You are speaking now rather of the social aspect of the case?—Yes, I meant that solely.

702. (*Chairman.*) Do you approve of the system of Staff College examinations and certificates being a *sine quâ non* for staff appointments?—Not quite. I

703. You are aware that under the regulation in existence now, under which the commanding officer of a regiment and the two majors are asked to give their answers to certain questions as to the capacity of each young man who wishes to go to the Staff College, they are obliged to certify before he is admitted to competition that he is competent?—Yes, that is now the case, and I believe it is now rigidly carried out.

704. If that is carried out, do you see any difficulty in the Staff College system?—If the commanding officer and the majors select the officers that they considered the best, some who would have made as a subaltern a good adjutant, that officer ought to make the best staff officer possible.

705. Might not the same sort of selection be done through the commander-in-chief, founded upon those confidential reports, would not that be a preferable system to allowing the officers of a regiment to make the selection?—No, I think not. I think that the Commander-in-Chief can simply go upon the general

conduct and intelligence of a young man on those written reports, but he cannot see a man on parade and study his characteristics as well as the regimental officers who see him daily and know whether he is really fit, what is as much wanted for a staff officer besides talents is tact. A man may make discontented all those that are around him from want of that tack and judgment, although he may be full of intelligence and have received the highest education.

706. Then the upshot of your opinion is that if those regulations were acted up to they ought to secure the best staff officers?—Yes, if they are thoroughly carried out according to intentions.

707. (*Lord Hampton.*) With regard to brevet, I understand you to say that you think that brevet has been carried too far?—Yes, that is my opinion, but I do not set myself up as a judge.

708. I think you expressed the opinion that under some restrictive regulation the system of brevet should be continued, but I think your reason for that opinion was that you saw no substitute for it. It has been suggested to us that a substitute might be found by the power which the Commander-in-Chief now possesses of promotion to substantive rank, or further by a system of increased good service pay, and further again by a system of personal decoration, or by a combination of those proposals. Have you ever considered anything of that sort?—No, I cannot say that I have.

709. Does it strike you, as I have put these proposals to you, that we might find either separately or in combination a substitute for the present system of brevet which seems to be considered objectionable by most officers, although they do not suggest a substitute for it?—I think your lordship means giving money for service instead of rank.

710. (*Chairman.*) There is a system of that sort at present in existence, is there not?—Yes, there is a good service pension that is given after long and meritorious service, and it is very much sought after. This might be added to.

711. (*Lord Hampton.*) As an extension of that system in fact?—Yes, as an extension of that system.

712. So far as my experience has guided me I have been led to believe that personal decoration is very much esteemed by military men. Do not you think that that might also be brought in aid?—In my opinion, decorations should be given for particular service, as it is done at the present time.

713. I will suppose the case of an officer who under the existing system would receive brevet promotion; my question to you is whether, having regard of course to the circumstances of the case, it might not be well to offer to that officer a decoration of which he would be proud in lieu of brevet rank?—I think it is worthy of consideration.

714. You do not at first sight see any objection to it?—No, I do not.

715. (*Chairman.*) Possibly that might be given too lavishly, might it not, if it was given as brevet rank has lately been given?—It might become too common,

716. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You agree, do you not, that it is desirable, if possible, to induce the officers in the lower ranks to leave voluntarily with a view of keeping up the flow of promotion, and that some inducement should be held out to lieutenants and captains to go out at an earlier period of their service, so as not to block the promotion? — Not until after a certain number of years' service; then I think there might be an inducement held out. But I would not recommend any encouragement to making a convenience of the service.

717. Would you say after 10 years, 15 years, or 20 years, for a lieutenant?—I think it would be very fair for a lieutenant after 8 or 10 years, and a captain after 20, or perhaps less.

718. It has been suggested, with regard to any scheme of that kind giving retirement to officers in that rank, that it would be rather an inducement to the better men to go and the bad bargains to remain; that a man who was conscious of ability but still with some hope on his side would say, I have not succeeded in my profession, I will take my money and go elsewhere and do something else, whereas a stupid fellow who had no desire to get on in life rapidly would remain; do you think that that would operate to any extent?—I do not think it is likely. You would find cases, but I do not think they would be many.

719. (*Chairman.*) Those who have an active spirit for their profession would be less likely to be tempted by those inducements?—Yes, certainly; a man who was really fond of his profession would remain.

720. You dropped just now that you did not approve of the uggestion of any inducement being held out to retire after 15 years' service, but do you object to any intermediate time?—My objection was that, in my opinion, 15 years would suit neither the rank of lieutenant nor captain.

721. It might surely coincide with the views of a man who had had 15 years' service to retire when it would not perhaps have suited him when he had only had 10 years' service; that man at the end of 15 years as a captain might be willing to retire. If you give him an opportunity of retiring at that time for a certain sum, whatever it may be, he would perhaps take it, but if you refuse him that opportunity, and say he can only retire after he has served 20 years, at the end of 20 years you would have to give him a larger sum probably to retire?—I take for granted that you would give him according to the number of years that he had been in the service. There is no doubt that many would be glad to retire at 20 years, but if a man chose to go out at 15 at a reduced price, anything of that kind must help the flow of promotion.

722. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Would you see any objection to the five years' rule of command being rigidly adhered to, if a retirement equal to the pay and allowances were given to the officer removed, or that the officer should retire on half-pay with the view of obtaining a depôt brigade or employment upon the staff, which if he was an efficient officer he would be sure to receive?—With regard to the staff, I am afraid that an officer would have not many chances. If you could secure an employment for this officer after the five years service, then I think it would be a good thing, as it would give promotion, but if he has done his work well for five years and has to go away whether he likes it or not, and if he is still efficient, I think it somewhat hard. If you improve his status I think it is quite right. If you do not improve it I think it is hard upon a man who has worked well and is still perfectly capable.

723. Would the brigade depôts and the staff find provision for the number of lieutenant-colonels who are removed from their regiments?—You must make the brigade depôts more tempting than they are at present.

724. There are two sorts of promotion in the service, one for service in the field and the other by seniority, will it not be necessary largely to increase the number of officers promoted for length of service if the line officers are not to be hereafter extensively superseded by the field officers of the artillery and engineers?—If you want the remainder of the army to go with what has been done with the artillery and the engineers of late you certainly will have to increase the brevet.

725. (*Chairman.*) The number of field officers in the artillery being different from that in the line, the natural consequence will be a supersession, will it not, I mean that the number of field officers being larger in the artillery than it is in the line it is difficult to keep the two branches of the service on an equality?—Yes, it is so.

726. Do you know of any plan by which that equality could be brought about?—No, I know of none. My only regret is that that extensive substantive promotion was given.

727. You cannot suggest any way by which they could be equalised?—Not now.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Friday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Friday, 16th April 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

Major-General C. P. B. WALKER, C.B., examined.

728. (*Chairman.*) I believe you have been some little time holding an official position in connexion with the German army?—Nearly 10 years.

729. What is the post that you have held?—Military Attaché to the Embassy in Berlin.

730. In that capacity have you had an opportunity of becoming tolerably well acquainted with the general system of organisation in the German army?—Certainly.

731. And also with the system of promotion and that of retirement?—Yes.

732. Is the system that obtains in the German army uniform throughout the several branches of the service, or is there a distinction?—Yes; I should say that it is uniform throughout the several branches of the service. The promotion is to a great extent by branches.

733. Still the system that obtains, although applied in each branch separately, is uniform throughout?—Yes.

734. By the different branches of the service I presume you mean what would be called in this country the various arms?—Yes, the various arms.

735. The system in the German army being uniform, may I ask is the organisation uniform. The system, as I understand you, which is pursued to regulate promotion and secure retirement is generally uniform, and proceeds on a uniform principle?—Yes.

736. It is applied to the different arms of the service separately, but the principle is the same?—Yes, the principle is the same.

737. Is the organisation of the different arms similar the one to the other, that is to say, is the strength of the regiment the same?—The organization is the same in principle.

738. Is there the same relative number of officers in each grade?—No, there are a larger number of officers in the infantry, in proportion to the unit, than there are in the other arms.

739. Is the relative number of the different grades the same?—If your lordship's question means whether the proportion of subalterns to superior officers is the same in the other branches as in any general branch, it is virtually the same. The number of field officers is virtually the same. Consequent on the late modification the artillery have now, I think, quite as many field officers as the other branches of the service; they had fewer before.

740. Are you aware that that is the reverse of what obtains in this country?—Very much the reverse indeed.

741. Have the late changes in Germany taken this direction, that they have added to the number of field officers in the artillery?—They have to a certain extent brought up the number of superior officers in the artillery to a proportion commensurate with that of the other arms. Still I should say the larger proportion of the general officers on service are taken from the other branches. High commands in the hands of officers of the artillery are very infrequent indeed.

742. That is where the vacancies are filled by selection?—There is very little selection in the Prussian army, so little that one can hardly speak of it as forming a part of the system of promotion.

743. If the organization is the same, and the relative number of officers in the different arms of the service is anything like the same, and the promotion to high commands does not go by selection, but only by seniority, how comes it that the general officers will mostly be drawn from the infantry?—The great portion of the generals of the artillery retire at the rank of lieutenant-generals, because it is very infrequent indeed that an officer of the artillery receives the command of an army corps. There are 18½ army corps, or rather, I should say, 18, the other being only a division, and as it is extremely infrequent that an officer of the artillery or engineers acquires the command of an army corps, you may say that in that respect they are at a disadvantage as compared with the other branches of the service.

744. But the command of an army corps is surely a matter of selection, is it not; it is not given by seniority?—It is given almost entirely by seniority.

745. Is that seniority in the particular arm?—An army corps is composed of all arms, therefore, I say, not in the particular arm, because there are, I should say, a fair proportion of the corps and other superior commanders who have been generals of cavalry.

746. But when you say that officers of the artillery do not generally receive the command of a corps, and when you say, nevertheless, that the command of a corps is given by seniority, how is it that it happens that the artillery officers do not in their turn get the command of a corps?—Because the feeling in Prussia is that the officers of the artillery, who have confined their experience almost entirely to one technical branch, are not suitable for having large commands; that is very strongly the feeling.

747. If the Government act upon that, surely that is selection, is it not?—I call it rejection. I am always very loth to speak of selection in the Prussian army, because really selection is so very infrequent, but rejection is what modifies their whole system of promotion. Officers who are passed over (certainly twice) consider it necessary to retire.

748. (*Lord Hampton.*) Officers of all ranks?—Yes, of all ranks; perhaps not a subaltern.

749. (*Chairman.*) Do I understand you that the system of seniority is broken in upon and invaded to the extent of rejecting all those who are not thought fit?—Certainly.

750. And in that sense the commands of corps are filled by selection?—Certainly in that sense.

751. Then I understand you to say further that, as a general rule in Germany, an artillery officer is not thought fit to command a corps?—He is very seldom given the command of an army corps.

752. If he is a senior, and his turn has come, and he is not accepted for the command of a corps, does he retire?—He would probably retire. I know of no instance of an artilleryman now in command of a corps.

753. There are 18 corps, I think you say?—Yes, there are 18 corps, and one independent division, which is that of the Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt. Of these, 14 are under Prussian administration, two Bavarian, one Saxon, and one Würtemberg.

754. In a paper which has been furnished to the Commission through the Topographical Department, which I believe was obtained through the Foreign Office, I find it stated that, "up to the rank of captain, "the rule of seniority is very generally observed" in the Germany army, "but in filling the vacancies in "the higher grades a wide discretion is exercised, "and only those are promoted who from their ability, "capacity for command, and bodily vigour are in "every respect fitted for the more responsible duties,"

is that conformable with your experience?—Certainly, that is the case.

755. "This process," the paper goes on to say, "of "rather wide selection produces the requisite flow of "promotion by which men at a comparatively early "age attain the different grades of field officer," do you agree with that?—I should say from my experience that up to the grade of field officer there was very little promotion out of the ordinary course of seniority.

756. I will read the next sentence to show what the writer means. He says, "An officer who, for in- "stance, as senior of his rank among the captains "finds himself passed over once or twice usually takes "the hint and retires from the service"?—That is quite correct.

757. But do you agree that that takes place sufficiently often to create a flow of promotion?—Certainly not, in that rank it is very infrequent indeed. In fact I might add the remark that the command of a company in the Prussian service is so important that it is a very indifferent man indeed who is not fit to take the command of a battalion. A company is the fourth part of a battalion. The captain is mounted, and he virtually in the field has as large a command as the commander of half a battalion in our service would have.

758. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) What is the strength of a battalion?—The strength of a battalion on the war strength is 1,002 men, each company being 250.

759. (*Chairman*). Then you say that a captain being a mounted officer having to command 250 men, if he is fit to do that, is really fit to take the command of a battalion?—He is usually fit to take command of a battalion. The grade in which the greater number of rejections takes place is that of major; the step from the command of a battalion is the command of a regiment.

760. (*Lord Hampton*). Do not you mean the command of a company?—No, the step in which the greater number of rejections takes place is that from major to lieutenant-colonel and colonel. In the Prussian army the rank of lieutenant-colonel is equally held by a battalion or regimental commander. The rank of lieutenant-colonel carries what the Germans call no "charge," that is to say, no special duty, a major may command a battalion, and a lieutenant-colonel may command a battalion. If a major who takes the command of a battalion becomes the senior of his rank, and his promotion takes place, he is made a lieutenant-colonel, but he does not thereby cede the command of the battalion. If his turn comes for the command of a regiment, and he is not high enough amongst the lieutenant-colonels to have a claim on the rank of colonel, he can hold the command of a regiment as a lieutenant-colonel, therefore, the grade of lieutenant-colonel does not, as with us, carry a specific command.

761. The substance of what you mean to say upon this subject I understand is that the duties to be performed by the lieutenant-colonel are not so different from those of a major as to lead to any number of rejections between these steps?—Certainly, the rank of lieutenant-colonel brings virtually no command.

762. What is the actual working unit of the army, is it 250?—The actual working unit is the company of infantry, the squadron of cavalry, the battery of artillery, and the company of engineers.

763. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is promotion regimental or army?—Promotion is regimental up to the rank of captain inclusive, with very few deviations indeed. Sometimes if the promotion is very slow in a regiment a subaltern will be taken out and promoted in another regiment.

764. (*Chairman.*) To follow out the questions that have just been put to you would you tell us shortly what is the organisation as we may term it of a Prussian regiment?— A Prussian regiment consists of three battalions under the command of a colonel or a lieutenant-colonel as the case may be. Each of those battalions is commanded by a major or lieutenant colonel as the case may be (I am speaking of the infantry at present), and each of those battalions consists of four companies, each of which is commanded by a captain (who is mounted) with one first lieutenant and on paper three second lieutenants under him, but from the difficulty of filling up the numerous gaps made by the two last wars there are seldom more than two second lieutenants in each company.

765. Then there would be one captain of a company?—Yes. The war strength is a captain, a first lieutenant, and three second lieutenants, but generally now there are only a captain, a first lieutenant, and two second lieutenants, altogether four instead of five for each company. The strength of a company on the war establishment is 250. In five regiments of the Guards, in peace, it is 165, and in the other regiments 139 men, besides the officers, hospital assistants, and artisans.

766. That disposes of the companies; from the company you go to the next grade, and that would be the major?—Yes, the next grade would be that of major of a battalion. Each regiment of infantry is composed of three battalions, and has a regimental commander, three battalion commanders, and one supernumerary field officer, who is a major, who has certain duties assigned him within the regiment generally, duties connected with the clothing and the regimental funds. The German expression is "the economical affairs."

767. Are the three battalion commanders all majors?—Majors or lieutenant-colonels, the seniors are lieutenant-colonels.

768. Does any such system obtain as obtains in our army, of army rank as distinguished from regimental rank?—Very little indeed—for distinguished service you may say never.

769. Is there such a thing as army rank as distinguished from regimental rank?—Yes, there is. Sometimes, when promotion has been extremely slow, the senior captain, more frequently in the cavalry than in the infantry, will receive the rank of major.

770. Still the system of army rank obtains?—Yes, the system obtains to a very limited extent. He retains the command of his squadron as a major.

771. He acts as major?—No; he retains his command of the squadron as major, and he acts in the regiment as captain. It is exactly as if he were captain and brevet-major in our service, but it is not a very frequent case.

772. (*Lord Hampton.*) Is that limited to the cavalry?—No, it is not limited to the cavalry, but it is more frequent in that arm.

773. (*Chairman.*) Without going into details, I want to know whether there is such a thing?—Yes, to a very limited extent.

774. You would say that the three battalions are commanded by three majors, but sometimes the senior officer would be a lieutenant-colonel?—I should say that perhaps three-sevenths of the battalion commanders are lieutenant-colonels.

775. Then a whole regiment, consisting of three battalions, is under the command of one colonel?—Under the command of one officer, who may be a lieutenant-colonel, but is more frequently a colonel. Lieutenant-colonels sometimes arrive at the rank of regimental commander before they have arrived at the rank of colonel by seniority in the army. They are extremely careful to regulate those promotions. I will give you an instance. The other day several friends of mine were promoted to major-generals, and I observed at the same time that several commanders of cavalry brigades were not made major-generals, and I said to one of those who was promoted, How is this; I did not know that you were senior to so-and-so? He said, Yes, it is true they had brigades before us, but they could not be promoted to major-generals at the same time that we were promoted, because the senior cavalry and infantry colonels do not balance, and they will not be promoted until the infantry colonels are also in a position to be promoted with them.

776. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) They avoid supersession,

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

do they not, as much as possible?—Yes, as much as possible.

777. (*Chairman.*) There is only, of course, one colonel to a regiment?—Yes, one regimental commander, colonel, or lieutenant-colonel, as the case may be.

778. What is this extra major that you have spoken of?—He is called a supernumerary major, and he is available to take the command of a battalion if one of the other majors is absent on leave or is sick.

779. Do they interchange their duties?—Not actually interchange; he is *le remplaçant.*

780. And is the result that they take it by turns?—No, he is the junior major.

781. And has no active duties until someone else is absent or incapable from ill-heath or some other cause from performing the duties?—He assists the commander of the regiment in the field, and undertakes the supervision of certain parts of the interior economy of the regiment. At drill he commands the line of skirmishers.

782. Has he any special duties?—Yes, he has special duties.

783. Which would be to see that everybody else is in full activity?—Yes, as regards these special duties.

784. Do I understand you (still adhering to the infantry) that the regimental promotion in a regiment constituted as you have described it is by seniority in the regiment?—Only up to the rank of captain; after that it is usual that the promotion to the rank of major should take place throughout the army corps, of which, as I have before said, there are 18.

785. Will you give us a little further detail as to the construction of the army; having described the regiment, how many regiments go to an army corps?—I think we had better go steadily upwards. Two regiments constitute a brigade, two brigades constitute a division, and two divisions an army corps. I might add what the actual constitution of an army corps is. An army corps consists of two divisions of infantry, each of two brigades, each of two regiments, each of three battalions, and one battalion of rifles. There are deviations from that. The Guards have two battalions of rifles. The 9th Mecklenburg corps has two battalions of rifles. The Bavarians have also a rifle battalion to each division, but I think those variations need not be mentioned. The Guards have also one regiment or three battalions of infantry more than the other corps, but this is abnormal; the normal formation of a corps in peace is, further, two brigades of cavalry and 17 batteries of artillery, a battalion of engineers, and a battalion of train.

786. Taking the three arms of the service, infantry, cavalry, and artillery, there are 8,000 infantry, are there not, in an army corps?—There are to each army corps on war footing 25,000 infantry, one battalion of engineers, and one battalion of train. In some of the corps, there is a regiment of foot artillery, in others there is only a battalion, so that the proportion of garrison artillery is not absolutely the same throughout.

787. What number of brigades of cavalry are there?—Two brigades, usually of three regiments each.

788. To revert to what we were just now saying, do I understand that above the rank of captain promotion takes place by seniority in the army corps constructed as you have just mentioned?—Yes, not exclusively, but to a very large extent.

789. In what direction is it modified when it is not fully carried out?—Men for whom there is no likely promotion in their corps are promoted into another corps in which the promotion is quicker.

790. Is it a system which obtains generally throughout the army that the army authorities, where they find that promotion has been going unusually quick, remove a man from a corps where promotion has been very slow?—Yes, into that corps. It is usual indeed to remove a captain to another regiment where promotion is likely to take place, because the officers in the Prussian service, when transferred to another regiment, do not as with us, take rank as the juniors of their grade, but they take rank in their new regiment according to the date of their army commission.

791. Are such removals tolerably frequent, or are they of rare occurrence?—They are tolerably frequent; a number occur every year.

792. Is the promotion from captain to major regulated by their army seniority in the corps?—Yes.

793. I think I understood you to say that rejection was not so freely acted upon in the step between captain and major as it was afterwards in the step between major and colonel; to what extent is it acted upon in the step from captain to major?—From the fact that a very much larger proportion of the majors are retired on half-pay than of any other rank, I assume that that is the rank in which the greater number of men are put quietly on one side.

794. Is the retirement wholly voluntary?—It is an understood thing in the service that every man who has been passed over twice certainly retires, and in many cases one passing over suffices.

795. Quite independently of being passed over, can a man voluntarily retire?—Yes, he can retire under the regulations of the Pension Act after a certain service. That is to say, officers who are 60 years of age can retire without giving proof of their having become physically unfit; from all others this authentication is legally required.

796. Would that service be generally reached by the time that a man would become major?—Hardly.

797. Then you mean that it is the number of majors who are retired that leads you to draw the conclusion that they must have been passed over?—Yes, that they must have been passed over for the command of a regiment, and therefore they retire.

798. Could a major voluntarily retire, and would the number that are on the retired list be materially due to the fact that they are inclined to retire?—No, I think not, because a man who is really fit for service would be very unwilling to be retired at the rank of major; he has all the hard work of the service behind him, and the smooth work is before him; the longer an officer serves and the higher his grade, of course the greater is the rate of pension. You may say that the officers of the Prussian army make the army their profession. There are a great many men of rank and family who serve for a few years in the army very much as our officers do, but the greater part of the officers are soldiers by profession, and they naturally look forward to the highest commands.

799. Then, proceeding to the step between major and lieutenant-colonel, or colonel, whichever is the term, from the command of a battalion, how is the promotion?—From the command of a battalion to the command of a regiment the promotion is general throughout the army.

800. Do you mean by seniority throughout the army?—Yes, by seniority throughout the army.

801. That is to say, by seniority in the whole army?—Yes, in the whole army in that branch. A cavalry officer is never appointed to the command of an infantry regiment.

802. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In the whole of the 18 corps?—The words which I have used in my report are "By "seniority in the several arms." You may leave the corps or you may get a regiment in your own corps, but the seniority is all through the army according to the branches or arms.

803. (*Chairman.*) The man who gets the step is the senior man of the grade below that in which the step arises in that particular arm of the service, no matter what corps he is in?—Yes, exactly so, if he is fit.

804. To what extent is any power of rejection acted upon in that step?—Most largely.

805. Could you give the Commission anything like a figure as the percentage?—No; they never publish any returns whatever, and it is quite impossible.

806. Speaking from what you have learnt in connexion with the German officers and the army, would

you imagine that that sort of rejection goes on to the extent of one half of the officers?—No.

807. Or one third or one fourth?—Nothing like it. That would be a terrible rejection which after 22 years' probation found such a proportion unfit for any further command.

808. If we say 10 per cent., would that be your idea?—I should be very unwilling, without asking the question in Berlin, to give any average.

809. What I want is to turn your expression into figures, when you say most largely?—I should call it very largely if one man in 30 was put aside, and I should call it largely if one man in 50 was put aside, under the present circumstances of the comparative youth of the officers.

810. That would be 2 per cent. you know?—I should call that large. It is a very delicate question. Promotion being entirely in the hands of the Emperor, one does not ask too many questions on the subject, unless one has a particular reason. I have no doubt that this average would be given to the Commission in a moment if it was asked for but I should not like, as a matter of curiosity, to ask for it myself.

811. (*Mr Bouverie.*) Is it really the Emperor himself or the minister?—It is absolutely the Emperor, assisted by the Military Cabinet, the War Minister has nothing to do with promotions.

812. (*Chairman.*) Have you any means of knowing on what basis, or on what statement of facts, the authorities act in rejecting a man?—Yes; they act on the divisional reports as to the fitness of all officers in the division for promotion, which are sent in by the lieutenant-general commanding the division.

813. Are those sent in periodically?—They are sent in periodically to the corps commanders who forward them to the military cabinet.

814. Is that done yearly?—These reports are furnished biennially.

815. This expression in the memorandum to which I have referred seems to me to be hardly justified by the account which you have given the Commission of the extent to which rejection is acted upon because the passage says: "This process of rather wide "selection produces the requisite flow of promotion, "by which men at a comparatively early age attain "the different grades of field officer. An officer who, "for instance, as senior of his rank among the captains "finds himself passed over once or twice usually "takes the hint and retires from the service." The tendency of that statement is to imply that a rapid flow of promotion is obtained by the system of rejection, that is hardly so in reality, is it?—I do not think that rejection affects the ranks to which this report alludes as much as the writer of it fancies. It is in the middle ranks that the greater proportion of rejection takes place.

816. But still the number of rejections, if they are anything like 2 per cent., would hardly affect perceptibly the plan of promotion?—I should be inclined to think that the rejections in the middle ranks are very much more than 2 per cent.

817. By the middle ranks you mean above the rank of major?—Yes, the steps between commander of a battalion and commander of a brigade.

818. Having dealt with the step of commander of a regiment, and the step of lieutenant-colonel or major, to that of colonel, what is the next step?—The next step is to commander of a brigade.

819. How is promotion to that grade regulated?—In the same way, virtually by seniority throughout the whole army in the several arms.

820. Is the same system of rejection applied to that?—Yes, the same system of rejection is applied, but I think more largely and rigidly.

821. There again I suppose you could not give us anything like an average?—I should not like to name any figure.

822. From the command of a brigade, what is the next step?—The division.

823. How is the promotion to a division regulated? In the same manner generally throughout the army, but not having the same regard to arms. A cavalry officer is eligible to command a division, and an artillery officer is eligible to command a division, but the instances are infrequent. For instance, General von Kameke, the present Minister of War, commanded a division during the war, and he is an engineer officer, but then he had also been on the general staff, and had command of a regiment of infantry at one time. He is an instance of a man having gone backwards and forwards through all the branches of the service.

824. You say that the rejections in that step are, you think, even larger than in any other steps?—Perhaps the largest of all. I am not quite sure whether the rejections to the corps are more or less than to the division; there are so many ways for providing for officers who have attained the intermediate ranks, such as governors, commandants of fortified places, the Chiefs of various permanent Commissions and other officers of that kind, which are given to officers of that rank to whom it is not wished to give a corps before it comes to their turn to have a claim on a corps. There is a great deal of delicacy in the way in which the matter is effected. I had best explain it by saying that men who have served any length of time are generally let down easily, they are not harshly rejected; but instances of men being passed over take place constantly, which are very marked indeed, and it is sometimes difficult to find the reason.

825. When you say that they are let down easily, you mean that there are a number of situations collateral to the active organization of the army in which those officers are placed?—Yes, and it is very often done in this manner, that they are given one of those appointments, while they are still five or six, or even eight or ten from the senior, so that their turn does not come for being actually passed over.

826. So much for the step to the command of a division, now we come to the command of an army corps; how is promotion to that regulated?—Very much in the same way, by seniority throughout the whole army.

827. Without reference to the arm?—The command of an army corps by engineer or artillery officers is very infrequent.

828. You have repeated more than once that it is infrequent for the officers in the engineers and artillery to obtain those higher commands, how is that consistent with the promotion going by seniority?—I know that they feel themselves in a worse position than the rest of the army, but there are certain appointments which are exclusively artillery and engineer appointments, and they are considered, to a certain extent, to compensate the want of promotion in another direction. There is an inspector-general of artillery, there are four general's inspections of field artillery and two of foot artillery, and there is an artillery brigade command in each army corps, and four foot artillery brigade commands for the army generally. There is an inspector-general of engineers, there are four general's inspections of engineers, and 12 inspectorships of fortresses and pioneers, but these latter are colonel's posts.

829. If the promotion goes by seniority, subject to rejection, do I understand you that, when an artillery or engineer officer comes to the front in his seniority for one of those higher commands, he is rejected and therefore, as you have told us, a sort of slur is cast upon him and he retires?—No, I do not think that in the case of the artillery it would be considered a slur. They are considered as a branch by themselves. They are certainly not satisfied that their promotion is not so good as that of the rest of the army, but they accept the situation.

830. So that in substance it means this, that promotion does not go by seniority including the artillery and engineers, but promotion goes by seniority, the seniority being calculated over the other arms of the

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

service ?—Yes, certainly, that would be a more correct way to put it.

831. That brings you up to the army corps, that is the highest I presume ?—Yes, that is the highest.

832. Before we go into the question of retirement and pensions, and so forth, I should like to ask you with reference to the age of the officers in the army and the number of years' service after which they generally attain the different grades ?—To the rank of captain from 10 to 12 years' service ; to the rank of major from 18 to 22 years. With regard to captains in some regiments, the promotion to the rank of captain being regimental, it is almost impossible to fix any average. Some of the regiments who lost very largely during the war had an enormous promotion, but others had a much slower promotion. There are now a few majors of 15 years service as officers, but these are for the most part officers who have attained their promotion through service on the staff.

833. But speaking of time of war promotion must be very different, but speaking of time of peace would that figure be something like the average ?—Yes, something like the average.

834. If a man became a major on the average from 18 to 22 years' service what would be the average that he would become a lieutenant-colonel or colonel ? —The rank of lieutenant-colonel comes in about five or six years As well as I remember there is no major in the Prussian army at present of older date than the year 1870.

835. My question was with reference to the number of years' service as a rule after which a man goes from the rank of major to that of lieutenant-colonel ?—You may add five years to that, say from 23 to 27 years' service.

836. From a lieutenant-colonel to a colonel or the commander of a regiment how long ?—Very short indeed. You may add another three or four years.

837. At what age do they enter the army generally ? —From 17 to 19.

838. Is there any limit of age as to entering the army ?—The limit is 23, but the great majority enter at 17, 18, or 19, that is to say, at that age they become officers ; they generally serve for more than a year before they become officers.

839. (*Lord Hampton*). What should you name as a fair age ?—18 would be about the standard. In talking over the subject of promotion with Prussian officers they generally assume 18 as the age of becoming an officer. A man becomes a captain ordinarily from 28 to 30, and a major from 36 to 38. That would bring us to the colonels and they would vary from 38, the very youngest, to 45, so that they get the command of a brigade under 50 years of age ; it is a question of chance.

840. You have given us the averages, but I may ask you generally whether there is a great difference between the ages of many of those officers ?—No, there is not ; there are isolated cases between, but they are all very much of an average age.

841. Will you mention the method by which more rapid promotion is obtained ?—By service on the staff.

842. How does that bring about more rapid regimental promotion ?—The officers go backwards and forwards from the staff to regiments. They are seldom allowed to remain long on the staff without going back. For instance, a lieutenant who has entered the staff with the rank of captain would serve four, five, or six years in the staff, would then be sent back to a regiment to command a company or squadron until it became his turn for promotion to the rank of major.

843. How long do they remain on the staff ?—That depends entirely upon whether they are particularly wanted in the positions in which they are. There is no fixed limit whatever, but officers on the staff are generally sent back to regimental duty with the prospect of promotion earlier than they would have obtained it if they had remained with a regiment.

844. Do you mean with promotion in their regiment ?—To a regiment. They are not sent back to their own regiment necessarily ; their connexion with their own regiment is entirely dissevered when they become members of the general staff.

845. Are they sent back to regimental employment in other regiments ?—Yes, but seldom until they have done actual regimental duty are they promoted to a higher grade. The promotion in the staff itself to officers who are not sent back to regimental work is somewhat more rapid than in the ordinary routine of regimental service.

846. Does that promotion in the staff carry with it army rank ?—Yes, it carries with it army rank.

847. Therefore, when they are sent back to regimental employment, they go back with an increase sometimes of army rank ?—Yes, sometimes ; but on the whole the promotions are largely regulated by seniority.

848. And therefore they take a higher grade in the regiment to which they go ?—Yes, certainly.

849. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Does so much service upon the staff constitute a claim to promotion ? —No, not in the least, no service in Prussia constitutes any claim.

850. But virtually it gives it ?—It is the habit, but no officer can claim promotion there from any length of service.

851. (*Chairman.*) If an officer serves with satisfaction to the authorities, when he does go back to regimental employ it is generally with promotion, is it not ?—Yes, he receives promotion to a higher grade earlier than his contemporaries who remain in the regiment.

852. What is the average duration of service on the staff ?—There is no average whatever, it is quite uncertain.

853. If an officer is removed from a regiment on to the staff is his place at once filled up ?—Yes, it is at once filled up.

854. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) What I understand is this, that if an officer is appointed to the staff, he serves a certain number of years on the staff, and, having completed that service, he is very possibly removed from the staff and placed in a regiment, and gets a step of rank earlier than he would have got it if he had remained with the regiment doing nothing but regimental duty ?—Yes, except that there is no certain time on the staff, and there is no time of service on the staff which gives the slightest claim to promotion. I may express it in this way, that the staff is a stepping stone to higher rank earlier than if the individual had remained in the ordinary routine of regimental duties.

855. (*Chairman.*) On what principle are the selections for the staff made ?—The selections for the staff are made almost exclusively from the officers who have passed three years at the Academy of War, who have then been employed for at least a year under Count Moltke's eye at the office of the general staff at Berlin, and who then have been employed in subordinate situations on the staff in different directions, and have been found capable and useful.

856. Is it a matter of option with every officer whether he will go to the War Academy ?—No, the numbers are limited.

857. What entitles an officer to go there ?—Three years' service as a subaltern (there are no captains in the academy), a good character from his commanding officer, and his being able to pass the requisite educational examination, which is held by a board of officers in the corps to which his regiment belongs.

858. Supposing there are 10 vacancies, and 20 men who fulfil those conditions, how is it managed in than case ?—It would depend on the goodness of the character given to the officer desiring to enter by the regimental commanding officers, and on the result of the examinations.

859. You think, then, that where the number of candidates for the War Academy is so large that some selection is necessary, that selection is determined by the report made by the commanding officers of regiments ?—Yes, and by the results of the qualifying examination.

860. You have described the system which is generally pursued; is it to any extent the fact, do you think, that those appointments to the War Academy, or to the staff, are given as a matter of favour by the authorities?—No, but there is a distinction between the selections for the War Academy and for the general staff, which are not made by the same authority. The selections are in both fairly and impartially made.

861. You do not think that there is any favour in the matter?—Not the slightest. I do not think that under heaven there is so just an administration as that of Count Moltke. I do not believe that there is any administration into which favouritism enters so little as that over which he presides.

862. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is that the conviction of the army generally?—Yes, thoroughly in the fairness of selection for the staff. I particularly remarked this very fact in the report which was published by the Commission on Military Education which sat here in 1868.

863. (*Chairman.*) Does Count Moltke make the selections for the Academy of War?—No, the selections for the academy are made by the Superior Board of Studies, Ober-Studien-Commission. The selections for the staff are made by Count Moltke on the reports that are made on the passing out of the officers from the academy. Count Moltke selects those whom he wishes to have on the staff, and the remainder of the officers go back to their regiments. It is a mark of distinction to have passed through the War Academy for the three years, because it is a very hard course, and the officers are employed in many ways according to their capacity without actually becoming members of the general staff. They are very often employed on the survey of the country, and there is scope for a large employment of officers as surveyors. They are also employed in the educational establishments. Adjutants are very much selected from those who have certificates from the War Academy.

864. Are they employed as aides-de-camp?—The generals have no aides-de-camp in Germany, only the princes of the different reigning families. They are all called adjutants. The adjutants to general officers are selected from those officers; in fact, excepting that they have specific duties to do, they are positively subordinate staff officers, but they do not belong to the general staff, and they have not the coveted position of being on the general staff. The adjutants are selected very largely from the officers who have passed through the War Academy. It is a very strong mark of discredit to an officer who is not allowed to complete the course. For instance, an officer who is idle is sent back to his regiment at the end of the first year, and an officer who does not progress commensurately with the others would be sent back at the end of the second year.

865. Attending the War Academy is not a matter by any means of relaxation to an officer?—Quite the contrary; it involves very hard study. The only advantage is that the War Academy is in Berlin, and that the officers quartered there are very comfortable, and are very glad to get there.

866. If they do not work, or if they do not progress either from want of activity or from want of ability, do I understand you that they are not allowed to remain there?—No, they are sent back to their regiment.

867. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is there any limit of age or service after which an officer may not go to the academy?—No, speaking from my recollection of the regulations which I read over very recently, there is not, but it must be remembered that they are only subalterns; there are no captains admitted. It must be while an officer is serving as a subaltern, and therefore there is the limit of rank.

868. (*Chairman.*) I presume that the majority of officers do attempt to pass through the War Academy, do they not?—No. I cannot give you the exact number without my books of notes, but there are only about 100 in each cœtus, therefore there are only about 300 at one time out of the whole army, and the number of officers actively employed in the German armies in this year is 17,213, not including the non-combatants.

869. Practically is it the fact that the majority of the subalterns do desire to enter the War Academy?—I think it is a very general wish; I think a great many do not feel themselves competent to go through the course, which is a very severe one, but I think the majority would wish to go through it.

870. Do the majority put themselves forward for it, and are they rejected?—Certainly not; about twice as many offer themselves as can be accepted.

871. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Is the place of those officers who are at the academy filled up in the regiment?—No, they go back to their regiment during the autumn season for the manœuvres. The course of each cœtus lasts from 1st October to 1st July in the succeeding year. After passing through the course the officers, who are likely to be employed on the general staff, are also sent for a period to other arms than those to which they belong, so as to obtain a general acquaintance with the duties of other arms.

872. (*Chairman.*) Then a very great number of candidates must inevitably be rejected owing to the number of vacancies not being sufficient to accommodate them?—Yes, the numbers are about equal.

873. And you have already said, I think, that the discrimination between those who are to be accepted and those who are to be rejected is made upon those regimental reports?—Yes, and upon the results of the qualifying examination.

874. Who is it that exercises that judgment?—The Superior Board of Studies.

875. Having got a general idea of the scheme on which the army is organised, how is a sufficient rapidity of promotion generally secured?—Partly by the great number of men who retire from the service, who thankfully accept their pensions, and who are worn out by hard work.

876. I am speaking now of peace time, such men would be high up in the army, would they not?—The work is a great deal harder in peace than it is in war; war is rather a relaxation. Every company gets one-third of its number as recruits every year, both cavalry, infantry, and artillery, and those have to be drilled by the officers of the company. There is no such thing as adjutant drilling. They have to be drilled by the officers; and many of my friends have said that, if an officer does not get promotion by the time he has had 20 years of subaltern's and captain's work, he positively leaves the service worn out in body and mind, from the incessant strain year after year of drilling the one-third of his company as recruits; worn out completely; therefore a great many really retire, taking a pension, because they have positively got quite tired out.

877. Are you speaking now of men who retire below the rank of major?—I am speaking of men who retire before they are in the rank of major. I think that a great number more retire as majors. I assume that the greater proportion of the retirement takes place in that rank.

878. What is the earliest period in point of years of service at which a man is entitled to retire with a pension?—10 years, if his health has broken down.

879. I do not mean to speak of health, I mean as a mere question of voluntary retirement?—No time at all. No officer can claim retirement before he is 60 years of age unless he can produce a certificate that he is unfit for service, but that is given very largely, every surgeon gives it in a moment.

880. Then that certificate is rather formal than otherwise?—Yes, rather formal than otherwise. After 25 years of service it is never refused. And retirement without pension is granted very largely to officers who have duties at home, and who wish to quit the army after having served a certain time; but they are from a different class.

881. Is that a large class?—A very large class indeed.

882. Do you say that there are a very considerable

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

6 April 1875.

class of officers who quit the army without any pension from private reasons?—Yes; in the guards and cavalry especially.

883. But does that also apply to the infantry, though in a less degree?—It applies to the infantry in a less degree.

884. May I take it that those are men with more or less of private means, and who are perhaps tired of soldiering?—They are men with more or less of private means, whose fathers die, and who have to go and look after their property, or who marry and retire.

885. And who for any reason are tired of the life?—Yes, but who go into the Reserve or the Landwehr.

886. That they are obliged to do, are they not?—Yes.

887. (*Lord Hampton.*) Are they free to go?—It is seldom refused.

888. (*Chairman.*) This retirement is therefore not absolutely optional on their part?—No, they must get released.

889. But the authorities do not, as a rule, refuse them?—As a rule they do not.

890. Although they have immediately to take their place in the Landwehr?—First in the Reserve and afterwards in the Landwehr.

891. You cannot, I suppose, give us anything like the per-centage for that class?—No, I could not. One great source of the flow of promotion since 1860 has been the successive augmentations to the army which have taken place. A considerable flow of promotion is caused by the removal of officers, generally majors or lieutenant-colonels, to the command of Landwehr districts. A considerable number of officers leave the army if they can procure other employment. As Reserve officers they are eligible to return to active service in the event of war; their rank going on during the time of their Reserve service, and they being also eligible for promotion to a higher grade on giving proof of efficiency; they are at no disadvantage through their temporary absence from regimental employment.

892. Speaking still of the ranks not above the rank of major, the retirements would either be in the class that you have just enumerated, or they would be men who are able to obtain a medical certificate, which you say they are able to obtain after a certain number of years, as unfit for service?—Yes.

893. Can you give us any idea of the pension that they receive?—Not without looking at the last published orders on this subject.

894. You have given us the mode of promotion and the probable duration of time of the holding of the different ranks up to the rank of colonel, and you have further described the higher grades as commanding brigades, divisions, or army corps; I want now to know what is the next step of rank in the army to that of colonel?—Major-general.

895. Are the numbers of major-generals limited?—No, there is no actual limit. The numbers of the higher ranks in Prussia are to a great extent limited by the charges, by the actual offices to be filled. There are a very small number beyond the number who are really actively employed.

896. But is there any limit to the number of generals?—None whatever in theory, in practice by the number for whom employment is provided by the military budget.

897. Although practically by far the larger part of those generals are not merely men holding that rank, but who have some active employment?—They have nearly all some active employment.

898. Take the case of a colonel who has ceased to command his regiment, is he employed at once as a major-general, or is he employed in any way. Would he have any employment after he ceased to command his regiment between that period and the time when he is in a command of some sort as major-general?—There would be no such period.

899. What becomes of him?—He goes from the command of his regiment to the command of an active brigade, or to some commensurate appointment.

900. When you say that he goes at once from the command of his regiment to the command of a brigade, does he at once upon so doing obtain the rank of major-general?—Not always. I see by a Prussian army list that of those who were colonels of infantry at the end of last year three or four were commanding brigades as colonels, while there were eight cavalry brigades commanded by colonels.

901. What is it that tends to the acceleration to the rank of major-general?—The general equality in all the arms of the seniority of the colonels, when they are promoted together.

902. If there is no limit to the number of major-generals why cannot a man at once become a major-general when he is fit to command a brigade?—Because there is a limit to the number of major-generals' appointments which carry pay. So that virtually there is a limit, that is to say, the number who can be paid out of the funds which are voted for paying the army.

903. That limit depending upon that certain sum which is voted for them?—Yes.

904. Practically, whether the number is determined by the vote of Parliament, or whether it is determined by the War Office, there is a limit fixed by the sum that is appropriated to that particular grade?—There is no particular sum appropriated to the particular grade.

905. But by the authorities, as I understand you, there is out of that lump sum a certain sum set aside for the generals?—Yes, the pay of general officers is allotted under the heads of their different employments, but I apprehend that, under the system prevailing in that country, variations would be possible.

906. And that gives practically a limit to their number?—Yes.

907. Then the accessions to that rank depend, you say, upon seniority in the whole army?—Yes, in the whole army.

908. But I think you have already told us that where one particular arm of the service is considerably more forward than another arm of the service, the authorities equalize that inequality by giving the step to the arm in which the promotion is less rapid?—You may say that they equalize it by delaying the general's step until they can be all promoted together.

909. From major-general, what is the next step?—Lieutenant general.

910. And is the next to general?—Yes.

911. Is there any special mode of remunerating any of the grades of general beyond that of the regular annual way?—No.

912. Is there anything analogous to our honorary colonelcies?—Nothing. The honorary colonelcies carry no pay.

913. (*Lord Hampton.*) Then am I to understand that there are honorary colonelcies in the German army?—There are Chiefs of a certain number of regiments; the princes of the royal families are Chiefs, and most of the reigning princes of the empire, but these distinctions are strictly honorary. The older generals who have distinguished themselves are nominated Chiefs of regiments, but without pay.

914. (*Chairman.*) In any of the grades or ranks of the army, is there any period of holding a commission beyond which an officer is not allowed to hold that commission?—No.

915. That is a remark which applies, does it not, throughout the whole army and through every grade?—Yes, throughout the whole army, through every grade and every appointment.

916. Then to whatever extent the superior officers are brought forward at an early age, that early promotion must be achieved by the means which you have already described through the staff appointment and a sort of brevet rank?—It is not impossible that an officer may be promoted by selection but it is very rare.

917. I am speaking not of an exceptional thing but of a general system. There is no general system for the purpose of securing officers of a certain young age

dependent upon requiring men to retire in the different ranks after they attain a certain age?—No.

918. There are no compulsory retirements except for inefficiency?—No. The emperor would tell a corps commander that he thought he was getting too old for his work, and then of course he would think fit to retire.

919. But officers who have attained their 60th year can claim to retire, can they not, quite independently of a medical certificate?—Yes, certainly.

920. It says in this memorandum "Officers who "claim their pension and have not yet completed their "60th year of age are obliged to give proofs of their "being unfitted for service. Those who have com- "pleted their 60th year can claim their pension un- "conditionally"?—That is the rule. As I said before the medical certificate is a mere form.

921. We can quite understand that you do not look upon the medical certificate as anything very substantial, but if this statement is correct an officer after 60 years of age can claim his retirement without a medical certificate?—That is the case.

922. What relation does the number of generals bear to the other ranks; can you give the Commission any figures which would show that?—Certainly. I could give it to you in a moment if I had the Prussian army budget for the year in my hand. I know there is a copy of it in the Topographical Office.

923. Could you give us a general idea; are the number of generals more numerous, do you think, in proportion to the other grades of the service than they are in this country, where, as you are aware, we have only 275?—Yes, but that includes not only the generals who are on the active list, but it includes all the retired generals, those who are not employed.

924. Have you any in Prussia who are not employed?—The generals would go to some active position. The last return published of the officers on the active list according to rank is dated the 15th of February 1874, and it shows the following results?—Prussian generals and lieutenant-generals, 70; major-generals, 185; field officers with rank of regimental commanders, 309; field officers, 1,143, that is, field officers not having the rank of regimental commander, not commanding regiments, or holding analogous positions on the staff. There are certain staff appointments which are equivalent to the command of a regiment. Then there are captains, 2,901; lieutenants, 10,432; medical officers, 1,316; judge advocates, 125; chaplains (of whom 102 are sacristans), 217; and officials, that is, employés of the government, 3,404.

925. To pursue the staff of general officers, is there a retired list?—There are the officers who are pensioned, who are clear of the army altogether, and who are never expected to serve again.

926. Do they form part of the list of generals?—They form a separate part.

927. Then that is a separate list?—Yes, an entirely separate list of retired generals.

928. What regulates the circumstances under which a man is retired from the active to the retired list?—Inefficiency, physical incapability for service, or his own desire after having completed a full term of service.

929. Is that inefficiency presumed from any length of service, or is it a matter of fact which is ascertained in each case?—It is a matter of fact ascertained in each case, and entirely in the hands of the Emperor.

930. Does the retirement take place at the suggestion of the officer himself?—The Emperor knows every superior officer personally. In the case of such officers he would probably hint to them when the time for their retirement had arrived. Officers under the rank of corps commanders would of course be reported upon by their immediate superiors. The corps commanders would only be retired by a hint from the Emperor. Otherwise there is no limit of age. As long as a man considers himself capable of performing his duty the Emperor does not cast him off. There is no limit as to age whatever.

931. (*Lord Hampton.*) And none as to service?—None whatever.

932. (*Chairman.*) You say that a man is only put on the retired list from inefficiency, and that it is intimated to him; but is the conclusion that he is inefficient drawn from some reports?—Drawn from the reports of his superiors. In the case of lieutenant-generals, or in the case of major-generals, it would be drawn from the report of the corps commander.

933. In the case of commanders of corps having no superiors above them, how would it be?—From the inferences drawn by the Emperor himself, who personally sees every portion of his army, and knows everything that goes on in it.

934. Have you any idea of the proportion in which generals would be retired as against those that are active?—There are two categories of pensioned officers, those who are on the ordinary pension list and those who are on the pension list provided out of the French indemnity, and who therefore retired subsequent to the last war. They are considered to have retired in consequence of being worn out by the severity of the last war. There are two absolutely separate pension lists; the one is voted annually by the Imperial Diet, and the other is paid out of the sum of 187,000,000 thalers which has been funded in such a manner that it will entirely expire, I think, in 44 years. At any rate, there is an actuaries' calculation of when it will no longer be required for the present incumbents. It is all calculated on actuaries' tables that this fund is to expire in a certain number of years.

935. What are the numbers of pensioned officers?—The numbers receiving Prussian pensions are 28 generals, 145 lieutenant-generals, and 214 major-generals. I am speaking now, not of the whole German army but the Prussian, that is to say, of those belonging to the corps under Prussian administration.

936. Were those generals included in the previous figures that you gave us of the Prussian generals?—No.

937. The figures that you gave us before were the number of active generals?—Yes, the number of active generals; besides which, in Prussia, beyond the numbers last mentioned by me there are paid out of the Pensions Fund provided from the French indemnity, nine generals, 23 lieutenant-generals, and 30 major-generals.

938. Does this system of dividing the general list into two lists, practically the one a retired and pension list and the other an active list, enable the Prussian authorities to put general officers in the high ranks of command without being obliged to go down into the rank of colonel for those commands?—Yes, certainly.

939. Are the pensions of those retired general officers all the same, or is there any difference in the pensions of the different generals?—The pension entirely depends upon the number of years of a man's service, and the grade he last held.

940. I want to ask you a little further with regard to the system of promotion which you say has obtained by means of passing through the War Academy, from the War Academy on the staff, and back again from the staff to regimental employment in a higher grade; are those promotions entirely regulated by the amount of mental acquirement which a man may have attained in the War Academy, or are they regulated by any general views as to his capacity for an officer's position in the particular rank?—I should say that they were regulated nearly as much by the reports of his commanding officer as to his capabilities.

941. Those capabilities including physical and moral qualities?—Yes. I mean the physical and moral qualities as well as the intellectual. The intellectual attainments shown at the War Academy would be more likely to regulate the mode in which he was to be employed.

942. But the employment of him on his successful attainment of a superior grade through his staff appointment would be dependent as much or more

Maj. Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

upon his other qualifications as it would be upon his moral and mental acquirements?—Certainly.

943. Do the officers commanding regiments make full reports upon those particular capacities to which I am now alluding, excluding mental attainments?—Yes, certainly.

944. And those qualities are highly considered, are they, in the judgment of those who have to advance the man to promotion?—Very highly indeed. For instance, no officer would be employed on the staff who was not a good rider.

945. Or who had not a sufficiently strong physique?—Precisely so.

946. Is good temper, tact, and judgment very much attended to?—Very much. That would be one of the qualities specially reported upon by the officer commanding his regiment, particularly whether he had shown himself capable of understanding his position towards his superiors and towards his inferiors.

947. And his general capacity for influencing others and drawing them after him in command?—Yes, that is very much attended to indeed.

948. With regard to general character and conduct in the regiment, is there any system by which the men who fall short in that respect are either delayed in their promotion or retired?—The courts of honour which are formed in every regiment have the power of pronouncing on the conduct of every officer in the regiment.

949. Are there more than one of those courts to every regiment?—There is the Court of honour and the Council of honour.

950. Those courts, I presume, are both of them formed out of the officers of the particular regiment?—Entirely out of the officers of their regiment.

951. Do they take cognizance of general conduct?—They take cognizance of the general conduct of the officers of the regiment.

952. What sort of conduct comes under their cognizance?—Even so far down as keeping low company, not associating with persons of a proper rank of life, reckless debt, the scandal of quarrels in places of public resort, inferior and degrading marriages; you may say, in fact, general gentlemanlike conduct.

953. Gentlemanlike conduct considered in a very wide relation?—In a very wide relation indeed.

954. (*Lord Hampton.*) Is there such a court in every regiment?—Yes, in every regiment.

955. (*Chairman.*) I presume that the regimental courts so constituted that take cognizance of those matters have not the absolute power of acting upon them?—No, only the King; the commanding officer reports to the King.

956. Practically I suppose those reports are attended to by the authorities?—Almost invariably.

957. How are those courts constituted?—I sent home the new regulations of the courts of honour last summer and I do not think on mere memory without having something to turn my hand to that I could go into that. The court of honour is formed of the whole of the officers of the regiment and then there is a council of honour formed of three officers which consults on the subject and advises the commanding officer. They are in fact his council.

958. Is the course of procedure for this subordinate court or council to investigate any particular case of special delinquency and then to report to the general court or to the commanding officer?—To the commanding officer and he brings the matter before the court of honour of the regiment which consists of the whole of the officers. They are called the Ehrengericht and the Ehrenrath.

959. To recur to the retirement which creates promotion, from your account, as far as I understand it, the retirements consist first of all of those who voluntarily retire, having private reasons of their own, and who do not require the pension, and secondly of those who after 20 or 25 years' service can get a medical certificate?—Yes.

960. Are the retirements numerous in that way in proportion to the number of officers in the regiment in the year or is it a rare thing?—I should say that the retirements are very much the same as those of our own army.

961. Is the retiring pension under such circumstances tolerably liberal?—Very liberal indeed. The amount of the pension is reckoned according to the period of service on the service pay liable to be counted for pension of an appointment held for at least one year previous to the retirement. If the release takes place after the conclusion of the tenth but before the completion of the eleventh year of service the pension amounts to $\frac{20}{80}$ths of the pay allowed to count.

962. The full service pay of the individual in the rank which he holds at the time that he quits it if he has been there a year is divided into 80ths?—Yes.

963. And he receives after 10 years' service $\frac{20}{80}$ths?—Yes, that is to say, that portion of the full service pay which is countable, there are some trifling deductions.

964. But allowing for those deductions, the sum that is taken into account is not the mere regimental pay but all allowances besides, is it not?—Yes, even in the case of subordinate officers an allowance for a servant and medical attendance, but beyond the amount of $\frac{60}{80}$ths of this income, there is no increase upon the annual amount of pension.

965. Sixty-eightieths would be the highest?—Yes, therefore a man has no object in serving after becoming entitled to that pension of $\frac{60}{80}$ths.

966. There is no object in a man continuing to serve after he has had 50 years' service?—No.

967. If he goes on serving he may get his whole pay, may he not?—No, he could get no higher rate of pension than the $\frac{60}{80}$ths.

968. What I mean is that he has no object in waiting for a further period before he retires, but he has an object in remaining on in the service after he is inefficient, because he gets more pay in the service than he gets out of it?—Yes.

969. What in our money is the pay of a captain?—I have not the exact amount of pay here, but I have it very nearly. I have the amount of pay on which an officer is allowed to reckon pension, which is a trifle less than the real amount. The pay of a major or lieutenant-colonel commanding a battalion on which he is allowed to reckon pension is 326*l.* 10*s.* a year, of a captain of the first class 251*l.* 10*s.* a year, of a captain of the second class 179*l.* 10*s.* a year. There are two classes of captains, first and second. The six senior captains of an infantry regiment of the Line have a higher grade of pay than the six juniors. In the Guard regiments there are seven captains of the first class, five of the second; in the cavalry three of the first, and two of the second.

970. As the annual pay on which he would be allowed to calculate his pension is 236*l.*, if he obtain the full amount of pension from that he would have three-fourths of it?—Yes, and you must add to that in the case of a captain compensation for a servant. I see that the total sum on which a captain of the first class is allowed to reckon his claim for pension is 251*l.* 10*s.* a year.

971. We have a table here which has been furnished to us as part of the memorandum from the Topographical Office, in which the figures stand in this way—"Captain of infantry or cavalry, first class, annual amount of service income, 227*l.*?—I hold in my hand the last official paper on the subject that has been published, which says, "Captain of the first class "cavalry or infantry, 5,030 marks;" a mark is 1*s.*, so that 5,030 marks are 251*l.* 10*s.*, that is including everything on which he is allowed to claim pension. The paper from the Topographical office probably gives the pay only. As representing the sum on which pension may be calculated are included the lodging money which has lately been largely increased, and in the case of the junior ranks table money and compensation for treatment in hospital.

972. There must have been probably some increase since this paper was drawn up?—There must have

been some alteration, or they may not have been aware that there is 15*l.* a year allowed to be reckoned for the loss of the use of a servant by all officers of and below the rank of captain of the second class.

973. If it were 251*l.* as you say, three-fourths of that would be upwards of 200*l.* a year?—But you cannot contemplate the possibility of a man serving 50 years, and being released from service as captain. The pension which a captain would receive who was allowed to quit the service after 25 years would be 1,834 marks, that is 91*l.* 14*s.*

974. According to this table it is 99*l.* 10*s.* after 25 years' service, so that it would be about 100*l.* a year, or something of that sort, speaking roughly?—Yes, 100*l.* a year, and taking the fact into consideration that a man has remained a captain till he has had 25 years' service. It must be remembered that in reckoning service for pension the war years are counted double.

975–6. The pension of a field officer commanding a battalion, which would be the next step above, after 25 years' service would be 132*l.*?—According to the paper which I hold in my hand it would be 204*l.*, and this is the very last return on the subject.

977. There is one question which I omitted to ask you with reference to the promotions through what we should call the Staff College, but which is called in Prussia the War Academy; do those promotions, which are given by reason of superior merit, cause any dissatisfaction or jealousy among the other officers?—There is no promotion given for passage through the War Academy.

978. After passing through the War Academy, and serving on the staff, as I understand, it is a common thing to reward a man, if he is very efficient, by giving him brevet rank, that is to say, a step in rank, and then removing him to regimental employment in that rank?—It is more than brevet rank, because an officer on the staff promoted from a captain to a major would receive the full pay of a major, and it would be actual promotion to the rank of major whilst still on the staff.

979. And then he is returned?—Not invariably, but very often. Service on the staff is invariably bined with intervals of duty with the troops; so that education on the staff is, perhaps, the most certain road to future employment in the higher commands.

980. As a matter of fact, when a man has served on the staff, and goes out of the staff, is he not generally restored to regimental employment in some form?—He can only go back to regimental employment, there is no intermediate status.

981. With a higher step of rank than that which they occupied when they were last in their regiment? Certainly.

982. Does that create jealousy or dissatisfaction amongst those who are merely advancing by seniority in their regiment?—No; I do not think it does. The work on the staff is so extremely hard that there are a great many men who prefer steadily working on in the regiment to the increased hard work that they have on the staff. They are satisfied to do so, and I do not think it does create jealousy; certainly, in speaking of the present time, the matter is so fairly conducted by Count Moltke that the jealousy towards the staff is very small indeed. It is universally acknowledged in the Prussian army that his selections are so thoroughly good that nothing can be alleged against them. I think, however, it is a system which in some countries might lead to great jobbery and great jealousy.

983. If not very impartially and justly administered?—Exactly so.

984. I should like to get something like a general idea from you as to the extent to which this system of promotion, other than mere promotion by seniority prevails?—That I could only give you from Berlin, by comparing the seniority list, showing the number of years each man was in the service. It really prevails to a very limited extent indeed.

985. Are you sufficiently acquainted with the organization in those regiments to be able to tell me whether out of the 12 captains there would be two or three that had received this promotion by reason of this staff employment?—Not amongst the captains, certainly.

986. Amongst the majors, would you say?—It must be a very small proportion after all. The great majority of officers obtain their promotion through regimental duty, that is to say, through duty in the ranks.

987. And therefore by seniority?—Yes, and therefore by seniority.

988. Subject to rejection in the way that you have already described?—Yes, subject to rejection. The rule of promotion in the Prussian army is virtually by seniority.

989. And also there are those steps of promotion given through the medium of the Staff College or service, and as aide-de-camp, probably, to princes of the Royal house?—Yes, they are promoted earlier than others.

990. That has rather met with dissatisfaction, I suppose?—Yes, it may meet with dissatisfaction, although I must say that they generally select very good men, and the Emperor particularly.

991. But still all those which I may call good service promotions are but a very small proportion of the whole?—They are but a very small proportion.

992. So that substantially the promotion is promotion by seniority?—Substantially the promotion is promotion by seniority.

993. (*Lord Hampton.*) Is there the rank of field marshal in the Prussian army?—Yes.

994. How is that rank applied? Is it only to royal persons?—No, there are six who are not royal.

995. But there is no limit to the number, I suppose?—No limit whatever, and it carries no higher pay with it. There is no rank eligible for pension higher than that of a general commanding an army corps.

996. In the case of a general, does his pay depend upon his rank and standing, or upon his duties?—There is a modification in that. A lieutenant-general commanding a division would receive a higher pay than a major-general commanding a division.

997. Then it does depend upon the rank in fact?—It depends upon the rank combined with the charge.

998. I think you said that there exists nothing in the Prussian army which is at all analogous to our system in England of remunerating military service by what are called honorary colonelcies?—No, there is not with pay.

999. I presume, therefore, that the remuneration of general officers turns upon their rank and standing?—Entirely.

1000. Then do I understand that the pay of a general officer is a graduated scale depending upon rank?—Certainly, upon rank and charge.

1001. But it is a graduated scale, ranging from the lower payment for major-generals up to a higher payment for generals?—Yes, for generals commanding corps.

1002. What, may I ask, in your opinion is the best system for an army? Do you think it is better to adopt that system, or do you think it is better to have a system under which one half of our generals are paid 450*l.* a year and then jump to a thousand the next day?—There is nothing from my experience in Prussia from which I can draw any conclusions that are likely to be of the least service in this matter, because virtually only so many generals are kept in employment, as there are active situations for them. The others are retired, and not considered eligible for further employment, and there is an end to them; therefore, the systems are so totally different that I cannot think of giving an opinion as comparing the two. The difficulty under which we labour is the paucity of commands in the rank of general. The disproportion between the number of field officers and that of general's *commands* is so great that English officers, who have worn out their lives in the service as regimental officers, have the poorest prospect of making their experience available in a higher grade.

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

1003. You are not prepared to give the Commission an opinion as to which you think the best system of the two?—I know the system which produces the greatest efficiency for the country, and that is the Prussian system undoubtedly, because there is perhaps no army in the world where the officers are so fitted for the positions which they hold as they are there, or in which their interest in the service is sustained by the prospect of employment in the higher ranks if found efficient. I should advocate a very large increase to the higher commands in the English army. I think that the army should be organised in peace on the system of brigade and divisional commands. But I am aware that this is a question of the willingness of the country to pay.

1004. I presume from your last answer you not only, with respect to the subject of my last question, but generally, you consider the system of the Prussian army to be highly effective?—Highly effective.

1005. Is it a system which is appoved of and commands the confidence generally of the officers who compose the army?—Certainly.

1006. It is not a system which leads to much jealousy or discontent?—I do not think it does. It leads certainly to heartburning amongst those who are set on one side. No man likes to be told that he is not fit for higher employment than that which he holds, and they no doubt feel that very keenly indeed, and it leads to great disappointment; but all promotion emanates from the Emperor; the Emperor is Commander-in-Chief of the army, and really the senior soldier in it, and I think that his decisions are accepted with great resignation, and generally by the army with great satisfaction.

1007. Those disappointments, I presume you would say, are incidental to the system?—Yes, they are incidental to the system, which requires a very high standard of efficiency, while they naturally cause great mortification to those who suffer from them. I understand you to say, looking to the army generally, as long as that system is administered with justice it leads to no dissatisfaction?—I think not.

1008. (*Chairman.*) When you speak of those who are disappointed, you mean those who are rejected in the way you have mentioned by the war minister?—Yes, not by the war minister who has nothing to do with promotion, but by the commander-in-chief who is the sovereign.

1009. (*Lord Hampton.*) Just now, in answer to a question from the noble chairman, you were asked what was done with an officer when he ceased to hold the command of a regiment, and your answer to that was that he never ceased to command a regiment; what did you precisely mean?—Until he commands a brigade.

1010. Therefore there is no limit in point of time?—No limit whatever.

1011. How long under that system is it usual in practice for an officer to remain in command of a regiment?—That is impossible for me to say, even with the help of the Prussian Army List. It varies very much indeed. Until there is a vacancy for succession to a brigade command.

1012. Could you give no average time?—I should say that the command of a regiment lasts from six to eight years. I think that is about the average period; at present, perhaps, not quite so long.

1013. I presume, from the mode in which you have put that before us, that the command of a brigade is the recognised status or rank to which the officers look in their professional race?—Certainly, but only as the stepping stone to the higher commands of a division and a corps.

1014. Do I infer from that that brigades are in full operation in the army in time of peace as well as in war?—Yes, certainly; there is no difference between the peace and the war organisation as regards the officers, excepting a slight augmentation in war. The whole army is organised in peace the same as for war.

1015. You mentioned the Inspector-General of Military Education; what are the functions of that officer?—He has the general superintendence of all the military educational establishments.

1016. What are the educational establishments?—There are the war schools, there are the schools for non-commissioned officers, and the board of examination of officers, which are all under the Inspector-General of Military Education.

1017. Has he or has he not a council?—He has assistants, but he has no council.

1018. He is the sole authority?—Yes.

1019. And that system, which seems from your last answer to be a graduated educational system, has for its head, if I understand you rightly, the War Academy to which you have before referred?—But which is at present placed under the superintendence of the chief of the general staff, and not under the Inspector-General of Military Education.

1020. But the Inspector-General of Military Education is at the head of all the educational establishments excepting the Academy of War?—Yes, excepting the Academy of War, which is now placed under the superintendence of the chief of the general staff.

1021. Are those educational establishments to which you have adverted establishments for the general education of officers and soldiers, or for professional education?—The war schools are the schools to which every young man is obliged to go after he has attained the rank of *fähnrich*, which is not exactly equivalent to our rank of ensign, because he is not a commissioned officer. He is between the non-commissioned officer and the officer.

1022. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I suppose he is the man with the silver sword knot?—Yes.

1023. (*Lord Hampton.*) Are you now speaking of the system of education entirely for officers?—Yes, entirely for officers.

1024. And therefore I presume it would be mainly professional?—Yes, it is mainly professional, during the first 8½ months theoretical, during the last 1½ months practical.

1025. Where are those schools?—They are scattered all over Prussia, at Potsdam, Erfurt, Neisse, Engers, Cassel, Hannover, Anclam, Metz. There is one for every two army corps as nearly as possible.

1026. So that no officer has any difficulty in getting to them?—He is obliged to go to them.

1027. How long is he obliged to stay at them?—It varies. 10 months now is the normal course.

1028. There is no country in which education has been more successfully studied than Prussia; therefore I presume that all these young men come into the army well educated in general things?—They all come in under a severe examination on entering, then, after attaining the rank of *fähnrich*, they are obliged to go to a war school, where they remain through the whole course, which is generally 10 months.

1029. And does the system in the war school comprise education of a general character as well as professional?—It is mostly professional. See my answer to 1024.

1030. Those I understand to be the only establishments of an educational nature which affect the officers?—Yes, except that there are the cadet schools, and the schools for non-commissioned officers. There is also a school for officers of the artillery and engineers.

1031. May I ask you whether they are for the training and education of non-commissioned officers and privates?—They are for training young soldiers who enter under an engagement to serve for a longer period in consideration of the education that they receive there, and with the hope that those young soldiers will become non-commissioned officers, they are allowed to enter those schools before the period at which they are liable for military service. According to the time that they remain at those schools they are obliged to serve a period beyond the period for which every man in Germany is liable, and they are educated in this manner with the hope that they may fit themselves to become non-commissioned officers. They

are intended to supply the great want of non-commissioned officers, which is now felt in that army very largely indeed.

1032. Is that system successful; does it act as an inducement to men to enter those schools?—Yes, I think it does. I think there is great anxiety on the part of the men; the schools are always full.

1033. Will you be kind enough to inform the Commission of whatever other educational establishments there are for the benefit of the army?—There are the cadet schools, there are two orphan schools for soldiers' orphans, where boys are educated, and all of those are under the Inspector-General of Military Education.

1034. If I understand you rightly, there are no schools for privates of a compulsory character which they are obliged to attend?—They have a sort of regimental school in every regiment. The proportion of men who enter without being able to read and write, or without a fair education, is extremely small, being only about five per cent.

1035. Is there much competition or difficulty in obtaining admission to the War Academy?—The difficulty is, of course, the limit of number, and it has been very much increased since the formation of the empire.

1036. How is admission obtained to that War Academy?—By recommendation from the officers commanding the regiments.

1037. Is it by anything like a competitive examination?—There is a qualifying examination. They have nothing in the shape of a competitive examination in Prussia, with this exception, that if more candidates offer than there are vacancies in the War Academy those who pass the best examinations have the preference.

1038. (*Chairman.*) That applies generally, does it not, to the whole of army arrangements?—There is no examination in Prussia where the number of marks obtains, that is to say, a scale of proficiency in which they give any one man an advantage over another. Those who pass the best examination in going out of the War Academy are those whom Count Moltke selects to go up for employment upon the staff, but there is no actual competitive examination which gives one man a better chance than another.

1039. (*Lord Hampton.*) That is so, is it not, from the top of the army to the bottom?—Yes, from the top of the army to the bottom.

1040. Do you conceive that the system of the War Academy has a beneficial effect upon the proficiency of the Prussian officers?—Certainly.

1041. Do you think it would be advantageous or tending to improve the professional knowledge of the officers in the British army if we had any extension of the Military College here?—I think that all education is invaluable. I do not think that an officer can be too highly educated.

1042. My question does not point to general education so much as it points to professional training. Being conversant as you are with both the British army and the Prussian Army, I should like to know your opinion whether the professional acquirements and knowledge of the British officers would in your opinion be likely to be increased and improved if young officers had the opportunity of following professional studies at a well-arranged military college?—Certainly. I should approve of any increase of educational knowledge.

1043. Founded on your experience of that a similar system produces beneficial effects in Prussia?—Certainly.

1044. (*Chairman*). But, as I understand you, it is a very small per-centage of the actual number of officers in the army that do go to this War Academy?—It is a small per-centage certainly.

1045. (*Lord Hampton*). With regard to the organization of the Prussian army which you have already described to us, especially the organization of the Prussian battalions, I want to know whether you as a soldier approve of the division of battalions into four large companies instead of smaller ones?—It is a very moot question even with the Prussians themselves. To enable the Commission to understand it one has to go into the tactical question, but I do not think that they are likely to change.

1046. What is the doubt with them?—The doubt is whether under the tremendous fire of the present day, one man can control 250 men in the field, for the simple reason that where he formerly did so on horseback, he cannot do so now, for I defy any man to sit on horseback under fire in our days without being shot down. And then comes the doubt whether the company is not too large. I think you will find nearly as many people who would wish to see the company reduced to 170 or 180 men as hold the contrary opinion from the difficulties which have arisen of late years. I think that many people would advocate it.

1047. Supposing that idea to be adopted, if a Prussian company was reduced to 180 men, how many companies would that give for a regiment?—The question has never been raised in detail, and I could not give an opinion upon that subject.

1048. Does the same system prevail in Prussia with regard to cavalry, is the unit of the cavalry the squadron?—Yes.

1049. How is the squadron subdivided?—The squadron is subdivided into four divisions, representing the fourth part of a squadron.

1050. Have they nothing that corresponds either in name or character to the English troop?—Nothing in the world, except in one regiment, that of the Gardes du Corps, where each squadron is divided into two companies; but this is quite abnormal.

1051. (*Chairman.*) What is the number of men in a squadron?—136 in time of peace, 150 in time of war, and horses the same number.

1052. Do you approve of that compared with our small troops?—Certainly.

1053. Do you think it is a more effective organization?—Certainly.

1054. How are the officers arranged in a squadron of cavalry in Prussia?—There would be the same number of officers as there are in the company.

1055. Do I understand you to say that there is the captain of the company and a first lieutenant?—Yes, and three second lieutenants, if they can be found.

1056. Did not you say that there were only two in this list?—I do not know a case in which there are three in time of peace. At the time that the last army regulations were settled in the Diet the third second lieutenant was insisted upon by the Government, and they have him upon paper, so that if they can get the officers they can draw the pay from the country; but virtually, they have not more than one captain, one first lieutenant, and two second lieutenants to each company, that is four officers. I am now speaking of the infantry.

1057. The theory always being five?—Yes.

1058. And the theory of the cavalry being also five?—Yes, the theory of the cavalry being also five per squadron, but they seldom have more than four effective, yet in a larger degree than the infantry, particularly in the light cavalry regiments.

1059. (*Chairman.*) Is there any difficulty in Prussia in getting officers to fill the ranks?—Yes, there really has been of late years. The candidates for admission to the army would not enable them to fill up the paper strength.

1060. (*Lord Hampton.*) The cadres are not filled up?—The cadres are not filled up to the paper strength. In fact they have only very recently filled up the gaps made by the last war, and that has been with difficulty.

1061. One practical result, I apprehend, of the organization which you have described is to give, I presume, as compared with the British army a greatly reduced number of captains and a greatly increased number of subaltern officers?—Yes, it does.

1062. Does not that materially facilitate the flow of promotion in the army?—No, I should think it would

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

stop the flow of promotion; but the promotion is facilitated by the large number of field officers in proportion to the captains. There are five field officers in an infantry regiment to 12 captains; that represents three battalions certainly, but the proportion is five field officers to 12 captains. In a cavalry regiment there are two field officers to five captains. That is where the promotion comes.

1063. Take the case of a battalion; I understand you that in command of each battalion of a regiment there is an officer who may be a lieutenant-colonel, or who may be a major, according to circumstances?—Yes.

1064. What field officers are there in the Prussian organization between the commanding officer of a battalion and the senior captain?—There is a supernumerary major of each regiment, therefore five field officers of each regiment.

1065. Are there no field officers between the officer in command of the battalion and the senior captain?—No. One commands the regiment and the other is the supernumerary field officer of the regiment, which makes the five.

1066. What are the special duties of that field officer, is he employed a good deal as what we call in the English army the aide-de-camp to the commander?—No, certainly not. The regimental commander has his adjutant who is his aide-de-camp.

1067. What are his duties?—He superintends the clothing, he superintends the regimental funds, he superintends the finance of the regiment, in fact he makes himself generally useful, and replaces any man who is sick or on leave by taking the command of a vacant battalion.

1068. You regard such an addition in the organization of a battalion as a useful addition to the regiment?—Yes, such field officer is very necessary indeed, but he belongs to the regiment, not to one battalion.

1069. Is it your opinion that irrespective of any difficulty of obtaining young officers to fill the organization which you have described the theoretical number of five officers for each company is sufficient?—Certainly not. The great defect in the Prussian army during the late war was a deficiency of officers, which was terrible even with the infantry. You must remember that they are augmented largely by those gentlemen who serve as *Fähnriche*, and who do duty as officers; but, even with that, one of the strongest reports that I wrote after the last war was pointing out the terrible deficiency of officers after the first battles in the campaign.

1070. As a question of good military organization what number of officers would you recommend for each company in an army so organized?—I should like to have quite as many officers as there were in the Prussian army, and always be able to keep them up to the full strength, and even with that the officers would have too much to do.

1071. Do I understand you that you would consider five to be sufficient?—I think five would be sufficient for 250 men organized in the one company, if that number could always be kept up. One thing must always be remembered in mentioning this, that the captains of the company have little or nothing to do with the accounts. The accounts are managed by the paymaster. One half of the whole wear and tear of an English captain is the accounts.

1072. Is there a paymaster for each regiment or for each battalion?—A paymaster for each battalion. The accounts are very simple; there are no stoppages like ours. The pay is sheer pay. There is a certain deduction for messing, and with that there is an end to everything in the shape of accounts.

1073. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You talked about there being a certain provision for general officers who are not considered fit for divisional commands. Can you name the nature of those appointments?—The governors and commandants of fortified places. There are a very large number of such appointments which require less active exertion than that of commanding in the field, which are practical retirements, and they are looked upon as retirements.

1074. You said just now, did you not, that the artillery and engineer general officers were practically considered ineligible for high commands?—They do not give them to them.

1075. Is this, do you suppose, because those officers belonging to ordnance corps are unacquainted with the other branches of the service?—I only give the result. They do not as a general rule hold corps commands, or, indeed, divisional commands.

1076. May I ask you whether in the Prussian army the officers of the artillery and engineers are not rather looked down upon by the officers of the other branches of the service?—I would not say that, but they certainly have a less share of promotion to the highest grades than the officers of the other arms.

1077. As a rule, generally speaking, the officers of the artillery and the engineers of the Prussian army come rather from a different class, speaking socially, do they not, from those who join the other branches of the service?—Yes, the far larger average come from the non-noble class.

1078. And are they contented to accept the conditions of the service which they joined?—Certainly not; they are very much dissatisfied with their position.

1079. Do you consider that the officers of the artillery and engineers in the Prussian army in the matter of education and professional acquirement quite hold their own with the officers of the other branches?—Certainly.

1080. What is the system of reward for field service in the Prussian army?—Decorations, promotion to vacancies in a higher rank, in cases of great distinction ennobling.

1081. There is no such system as the brevet which exists in our service?—No, except in a very limited degree.

1082. (*Chairman.*) Or increased pay?—Except in the cases of such generals as received dotations after the war. No decoration brings pay, but then the officers are covered from head to foot with decorations.

1083. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do you think that the number of the decorations has led to their being depreciated in value?—Yes, I think so.

1084. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Although you state that the decorations are depreciated in value, are not the officers very anxious to obtain them?—Very much so. Amongst sensible people the value of them is depreciated by the profusion in which they are bestowed, but there are plenty of men who are not sensible, and who are only too eager to get them.

1085. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Which do you think is the preferable system, that of rewards such as you have described, namely by decoration, or that which has obtained in our army, namely that of brevet, more or less well bestowed?—Carried to the pernicious extent to which they are in both countries, I do not know which is the worst of the two. I think perhaps the least pernicious of the two is the system of rewarding by decorations.

1086. From the number of Prussian generals on the retired list it would appear that the ejection of inefficient officers is exercised very freely?—Very freely indeed.

1087. Is an officer permitted to remain in the service if he has from any cause whatever been passed over from promotion by a junior in his regiment?—I do not think a subaltern officer would go from his regiment for being passed over the first time, but he certainly would the second; he would have to leave the service. An officer might be taken out of a regiment and put into another regiment with the view of giving him promotion, but that would not be generally done.

1088. Do the courts of honour or councils of honour deal with the case of officers as regards their fitness for promotion?—Not in the least, with nothing but questions connected with character or moral conduct.

Maj.-Gen. Walker.

16 April 1875.

1089. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) As a fact the officers who may not have given satisfaction in the command of manoeuvring or in the management of their regiment are removed summarily ?—Very summarily.

1090. Do not the Prussian authorities when the promotion has been more rapid in one regiment than another bring in a man from another regiment to equalize it ?—Yes, certainly, because the promotion in the junior grades goes by corps, when not regimentally.

1091. Is there any period fixed before which a man may not become a lieutenant, a captain, or a field officer ?—No, there is no limit fixed.

1092. Have you any idea as to the number of officers out of a thousand officers who enter the army who become field officers ?—No, I could not give you that.

1093. (*Chairman.*) Supposing 1,000 men enter the army could you give us an idea upon the average how many out of that 1,000 would go on to become field officers, and how many would go on to become lieutenant-generals, generals, and so on ?—I am quite unable to do so.

1094. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) According to what you stated, there are 1,143 field officers commanding battalions, and 13,333 captains and subalterns, can you give us any idea of what becomes of the 12,000 officers who must retire ?—No. There are 309 field officers with the rank of regimental commanders, and 1,143 other field officers over and above the 309, making 1,452 really.

1095. Can you give us any idea of what becomes of the remaining officers ; there would be something over 1,100 who must retire after from 18 to 25 years' service, to enable the junior subalterns to become majors in that period. The death vacancies during the 18 years would average only 3,912, so that there would be 7,800 officers who must retire from the service in some way ?—I should like to be allowed to answer that question after consideration ; it is a grave question for me to answer off-hand.

1096. (*Mr. Welby.*) You have given the Commission the average time of service, will you tell us whether the war has not done very much to accelerate promotion ? — Undoubtedly it accelerated all promotions to an enormous extent.

1097. Therefore, the length of service of which you have spoken we can scarcely take as the normal rate in the German service ?—I think not. I rather tried to strike an average between the abnormal promotion which has taken place since the war and the very slow promotion which was the case before the war. In the interval between 1815 and 1860 many men were 18 and 20 years subalterns, but there is no case of that nature now. The wars no doubt have accelerated promotion enormously. The promotion previous to the war of 1866 was lamentably slow. I have known men who had been 15, 18, and 20 years subalterns, and I have heard of one or two instances of men being 22 years subalterns.

1098. (*Chairman.*) And the other ranks in proportion ?—No ; because promotion is always more rapid in the higher ranks. A man who has been 22 years a subaltern is pretty well worn out by the time he becomes a captain, and he would be quite worn out when he became a major. There is such an enormous sweep in the higher ranks that only the more vigorous and active men would remain.

1099. The block takes place in the lower ranks ?—Yes.

1100. The figure which you have given us of 12 years, 18 years, 23 years, 27 years, and 31 years, and so on, for the different grades, if I understand it, are made up largely of the results after the war ?—Largely after the war. I should add from three to five years to each grade for the period previous to 1866.

1101. (*Mr. Welby.*) In stating the normal rate of promotion, would you at all modify the figures which you have already given to us ?—Yes, largely, because they have been largely affected by the war. On examining some old seniority lists I am inclined to say that, taking the 25 years which elapsed between 1835 and 1860 as an example, you must put back the whole of the officers by one grade as regards their promotion, so that as long a time elapsed before attaining the rank of first lieutenant as now elapses before the officer becomes a captain, and so on throughout. I believe this to be a fair estimate.

1102. I think I understood you to say that officers who come in and serve for a time and then retire for private reasons are considerable in number ?— Yes, certainly.

1103. Do I understand that they are enough to create a sufficient flow of promotion from the grade of captain into that of major ?—No, that I could not say, I think most of them retire as captains, and many of them as subalterns. I do not think that they affect the promotion of the army, but it is one of the causes of promotion. There are a great many men of good property who serve for a few years, and then go to the Landwehr.

1104. Is the service in the Landwehr a paid service ? —No.

1105. Therefore, a man must have sufficient when he retires from the army and goes to the Landwehr to live independently of his profession ?—Yes ; the Landwehr is largely officered by men from the class of the one year volunteers.

1106. Are there any inducements held out besides the retired pay to officers retiring ?—Yes, civil employment to a very great extent. There are many civil employments which are open to officers in the army.

1107. I think I further understood you to say that you think that the retiring terms are sufficiently liberal for the service ?—They are considered by th army to be very fairly liberal.

1108. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Are the Prussian officers obliged to serve in the ranks until they become officers ?—Yes, every one.

1109. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster*). Did the Prussian authorities consider promotion in the ranks previous to 1866 sufficient for the requirements of the service, and would they like the promotion of their officers to fall back again to that state ?—That I can hardly say. I cannot conceive that the Prussian authorities would wish for stagnation.

1110. In your opinion was the promotion in the Prussian army previous to 1866 sufficient for efficiency ?—Not for the present standard ; there were too many old officers in the army.

1111. (*Mr. Welby*). Is a paymaster in the Prussian army a military or a civil officer ?—He is a military officer ; but he is a man virtually in the position of a civil officer. The paymasters are taken from the ranks.

1112. (*Chairman*). Is there anything similar to what occurs sometimes in our army, that is to say, a man passing from the ranks as it is called ?—Scarcely ever ; and the very few that there are are generally provided for by being given certain appointments of a semi-military character very soon after their promotion ; but the promotion from the ranks is enormous, because so many gentlemen serve in the ranks for the purpose of obtaining the grade of officer.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Monday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Monday, 19th April 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Colonel JAMES CONOLLY examined.

Col. Conolly.

19 April 1875.

1113. (*Chairman.*) I believe you have been military attaché at Paris for some time?—Yes, for four years.

1114. Have you made yourself tolerably acquainted with the general system under which the French army is now organized?—Perfectly; it is only three days ago that I received the last system of organization which has just passed the Assembly, but I was present at all the debates in the Assembly upon that subject.

1115. The organisation of the French army has been in what may be called a state of transition for a period of the last two years, has it not?—It is about half way through now. The system of recruitment, the division of France into territorial military districts, and the cadres and effectives for the regiments are now passed, but there are to come, the organisation of the staff and of the intendance and commissariat departments.

1116. The latter branches of the subject, do I understand from you, are yet undetermined?—Yes, the two latter are. The bills are being prepared and are expected to come before the Assembly this autumn, but not before.

1117. Do those two latter subjects include the question of promotion?—They will affect it considerably.

1118. Therefore, as I understand at present, there is no system actually in operation in the French army which is definitely fixed upon to secure promotion and to regulate retirement?—The system which is going on now is the one which in France is known by the name of the law of 1832; that was the organization of the army under Louis Phillipe, and that may be taken as the basis for the whole system of organization, and especially of promotion in the French army.

1119. That is the existing system?—Yes.

1120. That is, as I understand you now, under revision?—Certainly; the bill for the revision I believe will come before the Assembly this autumn.

1121. Will you give the Commission the general organization of the French army under the system which you have just alluded to, and, first of all, what is the unit of a regiment, confining your attention at present to a time of peace?—A regiment is formed of four battalions, each battalion has four companies, and there are two companies of depôt for the whole regiment. Each company is commanded by one captain now; there has been a change made since the second reading of the new Bill in that respect.

1122. A company consists of how many men?—In time of peace a company will consist of 82 men, not including officers.

1123. Are the companies of the same strength?—Yes, they are the same strength.

1124. 82 men for the company multiplied by four companies would be 328 men to a battalion, and that multiply again by four would give you 1,312 men to a regiment?—Yes, that is so.

1125. Now will you be kind enough just to follow the same figures and give us the officers; what officers are there to the 82 who form the company?—Three; a captain, a first and a second lieutenant.

1126. What is the next grade of officer?—*Chef de bataillon* of infantry and *chef d'escadron* in the cavalry, what we call majors.

1127. A major would be the officer of the battalion in the French army?—He is a field officer charged with the administrative services. The majors and surgeons are in the *état* majors of the regiments, they have nothing to do with companies.

1128. To each battalion they have a *chef de bataillon* who ranks with our majors?—He would be the same as a major in our service.

1129. Are there other officers for the battalion?—There is a lieutenant-colonel and a colonel.

1130. That is of the regiment?—Yes.

1131. Are there no other officers attached to the battalion?—There are four *chefs de bataillon* to each regiment, one to each battalion.

1132. Are there no other field officers till you come to colonel?—Lieutenant-colonel and colonel. The colonel of a French regiment is not like ours an honorary rank; he is a man who absolutely has the command of the regiment, and he has got a lieutenant-colonel under him and four *chefs de bataillon*. The major in the French army is a man who looks after the administration of the regiment; he is what we might term a combined paymaster and quartermaster, and he has a great many assistants. The major of a regiment has nothing to do except the administrative part.

1133. When you speak of a major, do you mean a *chef de bataillon*?—No; *le gros major* is a separate officer, one to each regiment.

1134. Are the officers of a regiment the colonel and the lieutenant-colonel, four *chefs de bataillon*, one *gros major*, and three officers to each company, that is to say, a captain and two lieutenants?—Yes; on the peace establishment.

1135. Now let us follow the organisation higher up from the regiment; what is the next unit of organisation?—The brigade.

1136. A brigade consists of what?—Of two regiments.

1137. What are the officers of a brigade?—At present it is in a state of transition.

1138. What has it been under the law of 1832?—There was a general of brigade who commanded it, and he had according to the places where he was serving (for they varied) a staff under him, but the man who commanded a brigade was a general of brigade.

1139. Was there no other subordinate officer of a brigade, or were they all staff officers?—It varied according to the different commands. At places like Lyons, or Paris, or in Algeria, or at Toulouse, or the larger garrisons, the staff was much more numerous.

1140. What is the next organised body of men?—The division.

1141. What would a division consist of?—Of infantry, four regiments, two brigades, and then it had its artillery and its cavalry added to it.

1142. What would the number be?—The number varied very much according to the places.

1143. Of what rank is the officer who commands a division?—A *général de division.*

1144. From the division do we come to the army corps?—Then we have the *corps d'armée.*

1145. How is that composed?—It varies, there is no definite number. France is now divided into 18 *corps d'armée*, and Algeria forms the 19th, but they vary very much in size and in the number of men employed in them. There are 18 military divisions in France, each of which has its *corps d'armée.*

1146. How many divisions would there be in a *corps d'armée*?—There is no definite number. On the German frontier, they are very much stronger; some of them have one division more.

1147. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) If I understand rightly, France is divided, is it not, into so many local districts, each of which has a division?—Yes; each of which is commanded by a general of division, but the actual number of men in his command varies according to the locality.

1148. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Some of those commands comprise more than one division, do they not?—Yes; in Paris, General l'Admirault has at least 80,000 men under his command.

1149. That being the general organization of the army and the structure of the body with reference to the officers, what generally speaking is the rule of promotion, is it seniority, or is it selection?—Both exist.

1150. Is seniority or selection the rule?—They stick to seniority, or profess to do so as much as possible.

1151. By that, do you mean seniority in the army, or seniority in the regiment for regimental appointment?—There are certain grades in the French army that are necessarily by selection; for instance, the *sous-lieutenant* is always by selection, that is the first appointment. You go from *sous-lieutenant* to captain, and from thence to the *chef d'escadron* or *chef de bataillon*. They are supposed as much as possible, unless there is something very much against a man, to go by seniority; after the *chef de bataillon* or *chef d'escadron* selection recommences; and there are the lieutenant-colonels and colonels, and then the generals afterwards, and the *gros major* that we were just talking about, those are always by selection.

1152. But the lieutenant-colonel and the colonel are also generally by selection?—Yes, of course the senior man may be selected, but it is supposed to be selection, and with an army in the field it is supposed to be selection for all.

1153. But practically in time of peace up to every grade but that of lieutenant-colonel the promotion goes as a rule by seniority?—Yes, unless there is some very good reason for passing a man over. The *sous-lieutenants* are appointed by selection, but that is not promotion.

1154. All the steps of the regiment, except the first appointment, go by seniority, up to and including the step of *chef de bataillon*?—Yes, as a rule.

1155. Where selection intervenes, what is the principle on which the authorities of the French army exercise their selection? What means have they, or have they any system by which they are enabled to judge of a man's ability?—Every spring the generals of divisions or somebody on their behalf meet at a committee which is held at the War Office in Paris, and every one of them brings what he calls his *tableau d'avancement*, on which are placed the names and services and his recommendation of all the officers that he proposes to be promoted, he having at his inspection of regiments gone into all this with the officers commanding. This committee is held in Paris every spring, and it is on that system that selection is settled. Then the Minister of War has a good deal to do with it too, he is the president of this committee.

1156. Is this *tableau d'avancement* made out by the commanding officer of the regiment in the first instance?—The General, at his inspections, gets the recommendations of the colonel of each regiment that he inspects, and then he makes his own *tableau d'avancement* which he brings with him to Paris.

1157. I presume it is upon similar materials that the authorities exercise the power of passing over a man and rejecting him?—Certainly.

1158. Are you familiar enough with the officers of the French army to be able to answer the question as to how far that system is agreeable to the officers, or whether it produces heart burnings?—Undoubtedly it does create heart burnings. There is no doubt that the idea of all French officers is, that unless such a measure can be very strongly justified, the passing over of a man is a very great injustice.

1159. Do they look upon it that advancement is very much secured by interest?—Certainly they do.

1160. The colonels of the regiments, you say, do not make any confidential reports in writing; it is only the general commanding the division?—They make a report, of course, to the general at his inspection. In the French army every officer has got what they call a *dossier;* and every year this *dossier* is corrected according to the conduct of the officer. It is kept confidentially.

1161. Who makes that report?—The colonel, and the colonel gives it to the general.

1162. Does he show it to the officer?—He shows him parts of it, whether he shows it all I am unable to say.

1163. But the general feeling of the army, as I understand you, is strongly in favour of a sort of right by seniority?—Certainly.

1164. To what extent are men passed over on those reports? Speaking now of the grades up to and including *chef de bataillon*, is it a thing which very often happens?—Yes; and I do not wonder at it, because there are a great many officers who arrive at the rank of captain in the French army who have been non-commissioned officers before, and who are certainly very nearly 50 years of age.

1165. The fact is that a great many are passed over?—Yes, a great many are passed over.

1166. Especially in the grade to *chef de bataillon?*—Yes, many captains wait for that rank in order to secure the *retraite*, which is a pension, and they do not mean to go on; they do not wish it themselves.

1167. Does the step to *chef de bataillon* carry with it a considerably larger *retraite*?—Yes.

1168. With regard to the rate of promotion in the French army, supposing we take first the grade of captain, within what period of years, as a rule, do you imagine a man becomes a captain?—The men who come out from Saint Cyr from the schools, and pass in as *sous-lieutenant*, get to the rank of captain young enough; but the men who are promoted from the ranks, who have first of all served as soldier, and then as non-commissioned officer, have certainly, many of them, had 30 years of service in the lower ranks before they get to be captain, and a man may very well be 50 before he gets to be captain.

1169. Are there any considerable number of men at that age in the rank of captain?—They can now by the new law get their *retraite* after 25 years' service, and then all they want is their *retraite* and they are very glad to go.

1170. But then they go out as captains, do they not?—Yes, with the *retraite* of a captain. They all want to get to that rank, because there is considerable difference between the *retraite* of a captain and that of a lieutenant.

1171. Are we to understand that the earliest period at which they can secure that is 25 years' service?—Yes, it was 30 before, and now it is 25—they can go at 25 years.

1172. And although it takes 25 years' service to secure the *retraite* as, I understand you, many at that time have not yet achieved the rank of captain?—Yes, I have seen many grey-haired lieutenants.

1173. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Are those lieutenants who have been raised from the ranks?—Yes, all of them.

1174. (*Chairman.*) You have given evidence of officers becoming captains as late as after 25 years' service, does that apply only to those who have been raised from the ranks?—Only to those.

1175. In the French system the officers in the regiment up to and including the rank of captain divide themselves very much into two classes—those who have been raised from the rank whose promotion is, as you have described, and those who have passed through St. Cyr or some other college, and who get

Col. Conolly.

19 April 1875.

their promotion quicker?—There are two distinct classes.

1176. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Do those officers who have been promoted from the ranks associate wih the men?—No, they associate amongst themselves.

1177. (*Chairman.*) There is no mess is there in a French regiment?—No, the Emperor tried it in the Guards, and it even did not answer there.

1178. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Was it on that account?—I think so.

1179. (*Chairman.*) In what way is the quicker advancement of educated men who come from the college secured?—Because they do not go into the ranks at all; they come in as *sous-lieutenants* and work their way up. A *sous-lieutenant* is say 20, while a man who has risen from the ranks of the same grade is perhaps 40.

1180. When they once become commissioned officers they all go regularly on, do they not?—Yes, there is always a selection still.

1181. But I mean in point of seniority, they all count together?—Yes.

1182. And as seniority is the rule, selection, I suppose, does not do very much?—Yes, it does even in the lower ranks.

1183. Does selection mean interest, do you think?—I think it does, and favouritism and jobbery. I do not say always, but to a certain extent it is a very great evil.

1184. Those old captains that have risen from the ranks practically never get above the rank of captain?—No, they take their *retraite* as captain.

1185. Now, turning to the educated class, after what number of years' service ordinarily would a man have obtained the majority or have become *chef de bataillon*?—I know plenty, especially in the cavalry, from 30 to 35 years of age, so that it would be in about 15 years' service, the average all through would be higher than that. I should put five years on to that, say 20 years' service.

1186. Does that apply to both cavalry and infantry as an average?—The cavalry might get it a little sooner. I would put it at that as to the infantry.

1187. Perhaps 18 years would be the average for the cavalry?—Yes.

1188. Is there any limit to the number of years that a man may remain in the rank of major, without promotion?—Everybody at the age of 62, unless he is a general of division, must go.

1189. Is that the only limit of age that there is in the structure of the army?—The general of division, as a rule, ought to go at 65, but that is liable to very numerous exceptions; but at 62 any man, who is not a general of division, is supposed to go, it is the law in fact, he must go.

1190. Is there any line of age or service drawn after which a man must cease to be a *chef de bataillon*, or lieutenant-colonel, or colonel?—62 all round; whatever he is at the age of 62, unless he is a general of division, he must retire.

1191. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is there not an understanding that any general officer who is commanding an army in the field is an exception to this rule?—Yes.

1192. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Cannot the Minister of War except anybody?—The Government can except anybody; several generals commanding divisions now are above that age.

1193. (*Chairman.*) Can you give the Commission in a rough way some figures as to the probable average time after which a man would become a *chef de bataillon* or a *chef d'escadron* in the cavalry, and on what experience would it be founded; would it include the rapid promotion that must have been caused by the late war?—No, I have known the French army for a good many years, and I have thought over what I should put down myself as the average, putting the two as near as possible together.

1194. Promotion was slower, was it not, before the war?—Yes, before it was, and the whole system of promotion is even now in a state of transition.

1195. Let us follow it up from the *chef d'escadron* or *chef de bataillon* to lieutenant-colonel and colonel, within what time on the average does a man generally become lieutenant-colonel?—That is entirely by selection. I could not answer that question.

1196. What are the duties of lieutenant-colonel?—The colonel has the command of the regiment, and when he is away the lieutenant-colonel has the command. If a very strong detachment of a regiment went away anywhere a lieutenant-colonel would go in command of it.

1197. What officer in the French army is analogous to our adjutant?—There is a captain adjutant major, and his assistant, who is a lieutenant; there are two adjutants in a French regiment.

1198. Is not the next grade to colonel of a regiment the general commanding a brigade?—Yes.

1199. He is a major-general, is he not?—He is called a *général de brigade;* we should call him a major-general.

1200. How is the promotion to that grade managed?—Entirely by selection.

1201. Is there or not a limited number of generals?—Yes, under the new law there are 100 generals of division and 200 generals of brigades. They have been increased; the year before last it was 80 and 160, and now it is 100 and 200.

1202. Is that increase corresponding with any increase in the organization of the army?—France has now, including Algeria, 19 divisions while formerly it had, I think, six large commands which were under marshals generally; but now marshals are done away with.

1203. My object is to know whether those additions which have been made to the general officers commanding brigades and divisions were made in reference to and in correspondence with the enlargement of the army?—Certainly.

1204. So that there are more generals, because there are more such appointments?—Certainly.

1205. Is there any position in the French army which corresponds with what occurs in the English army, that is to say, a lieutenant-colonel who has ceased to command his regiment and has not become a major-general, is there anything like the system of half-pay which exists in this country?—There is the *retraite*, and he must retire from the service. There is no brevet or anything like it in the French army.

1206. In the English army a man may be in command of a regiment for a certain number of years as lieutenant-colonel; he may then go on half pay and remain on half pay perhaps for six or eight years before, according to his seniority, he is entitled to become and does become major-general, and during that time he may have no employment whatever; is there any such system in the French army?—Their name would be *en disponibilité.*

1207. To what extent are the men placed in that position in France?—If there was a reduction, then these men would be put *en disponibilité*, and would be liable to be called upon at any moment to be put into another regiment.

1208. During that time, does he receive his full pay?—There is the *solde de dispoinbilité.*

1209. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) It comes very near our half-pay system, does it not?—They get more than half pay.

1210. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Those men are brought in again, are they not, as soon as ever vacancies occur?—Yes; as soon as ever they can be brought in.

1211. It is not for their own convenience, I presume?—No.

1212. (*Chairman.*) They are brought back, are they not, into active service as soon as a vacancy occurs, without reference to the claim of seniority of those in the regiment below?—There comes selection again; it is arbitrary, there is no rule for it.

1213. We have in England two ranks, so to speak; we have the regimental rank, and we have the rank in the army. Is there any such distinction in France?—No; there is nothing of the sort.

1214. There is the army rank; does that correspond to the regimental rank?—Yes.

1215. I think I understood you to say, when speaking of the rule of seniority, that you meant seniority in the regiment and not seniority generally all over the army?—Up to the rank of captain it is almost the invariable rule that promotion goes in the regiment by seniority, but a *chef d'escadron* may be taken from a regiment in Africa and brought into one in France; it is promotion in the army as a rule.

1216. When a man is taken in the way you describe, is not that selection, or is that what you call adhering to the rule of seniority?—There is a list kept of the captains according to their seniority in the army, and when a vacancy may occur in a regiment, we will say in Paris, and they do not wish to promote the senior captain, and there is a captain at the head of the list who is serving in a regiment in Africa, he is brought and put there. It is combining the two, selection and seniority.

1217. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Then it is not selection in the regiment?—It is not in the regiment, but they always adhere to it in the regiment up to the rank of captain, if possible.

1218. Still there is no rule against going out of the regiment?—No.

1219. (*Chairman.*) When you talk of selection, is it a thing which is very often done to take a man from a lower position in the same regiment, and place him over the heads of his brother officers in that regiment?—No; I have never heard of such a case.

1220. When selection takes place it is by bringing in a man from some other regiment is it not?—Yes, generally.

1221. Is there any system of brevet in the French army?—No; it does not exist.

1222. It did exist, did it not?—Not in my experience.

1223. How are men rewarded for distinguished service in the field?—There are two things which are very much valued in France, one is the Legion of Honour and the other is the Médaille Militaire. A great many men would rather get the Legion of Honour than be promoted. I know gentlemen who mean to remain in the service a short time, and who do not intend to make it their career, and they would prefer the riband of the Legion of Honour to promotion.

1224. (*Lord Hampton.*) That would be in the lowest grades I presume?—Yes.

1225. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is that a large class in the French army?—These decorations are given freely.

1226. I mean, are the gentlemen of family or position who go into the army, not intending to make a career of it, a large class?—They are a very small class, you may say.

1227. Nothing like the same proportion as is the case in our army?—Nothing like it.

1228. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Military service now is compulsory upon everybody in France, is it not?—Yes; now it is. I am talking of the old system.

1229. (*Chairman.*) When you say that the service now is compulsory, can a man now get a substitute?—No, there are no substitutes allowed; this is the Prussian system which came in in 1873.

1230. If a man does not enter as a commissioned officer he must serve in the ranks?—Yes, he cannot go in as an officer except through the schools, he must go in as a private.

1231. Every man, no matter what his social position may be, goes in as a private, and he may in course of time obtain a commission like any other private, except those who go through the military schools?—Yes.

1232. How long are they at the military schools?—They are not allowed to go into the service before they are 18 as *sous-lieutenant*, and they go to the school at 16, but whatever examinations they pass they are not allowed to enter as *sous-lieutenant* below 18.

1233. How do they enter the school?—By a competitive examination.

1234. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Is it a competitive or a qualifying examination?—Now it is competitive, it used to be qualifying.

1235. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do they enter Saint Cyr by competition or by nomination?—They enter now by competition. It is published in the *Journal Officiel* when the examinations for Saint Cyr will take place, and everybody has a right to go up. They must produce certificates. A man must be examined by the doctor to begin with, who gives him a certificate, and the other is a certificate of morality, as it is called, which is from the master of the school at which they have been educated, and they must produce the register of their baptism, and their age, and things of that sort.

1236. (*Chairman.*) Do those who pass the best examination get appointed?—Yes, according to the vacancies.

1237. Are the vacancies very much fewer than the applications?—Yes, very much.

1238. Those who are rejected are greater in number than those who pass?—Yes, I know a great many gentlemen serving in the ranks now who have gone up for their examination for Saint Cyr, but have failed.

1239. Do you know at all the number who are educated at a time at Saint Cyr?—I do not remember now.

1240. Then they stay there, do they not, between two and three years?—Yes.

1241. And they come away, I presume, with certain certificates?—When they pass the examination they have their certificate, and when vacancies occur they are put into a regiment.

1242. Are they allowed to remain on at the college if they are not industrious?—No, there are so many applicants for whom there are no places, that they are too happy to get rid of anybody.

1243. Do they do so unceremoniously?—Yes, very unceremoniously indeed.

1244. Does that result in many being sent away, do you know?—I cannot tell the number, but I know that there are a great many, because I know most of them enlist and go in as privates.

1245. They would be obliged to do so, I suppose?—Certainly, under the new law they would. Then they have got in the French service, the same as in Germany, the one year volunteers. For instance, young men who are studying for doctors or lawyers or anything else, in order that their studies should not be too much interfered with, pay 1,500 francs and undergo an examination, and if they pass that examination, having paid those 1,500 francs, they go into a regiment for one year. At the end of that they pass another examination and, if they are fitted for their military duties, they get a certificate which enables them to go back to whatever their business is. But having done one year they are liable for the other four years. In case of war, they are liable to be pulled out of their places and put into the ranks immediately.

1246. But having gone through this process, and having paid 1,500 francs, constitutes, subject to what you have just said, a claim to exemption?—After having served one year under the colours they are free from the other four except in case of war.

1247. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Do you mean five years' service in the ranks for everybody?—Yes, everybody is liable to it—that is, five years under the colours and then for 15 years' service more in different categories of the reserve after that. All the one year volunteers at the end of their five years have 15 years that they are liable to for the reserve.

1248. Just the same as anybody who has gone through the five years under the colours?—Yes, precisely the same.

1249. Is everybody liable to serve, or is everybody liable to take his lot?—Now everybody at the age of 20 goes up in the department to which he belongs. They do not want them all absolutely under the colours, and so they take the number that they want,

Col. Conolly.
19 April 1875.

and the others are all drilled in their own department with the reserve.

1250. How long does that drill last for them?—Some of them are kept there for a year, and some for six months. It depends upon what number of men the general of division is likely to want. He has a certain number that must be drilled for a year, and a certain number for six months.

1251. (*Chairman.*) What regulates the number of the two classes?—That is entirely in the hands of the military authorities.

1252. They pick the men that they mean to take?—Yes.

1253. Then this system of volunteering for a year and paying down 1,500 francs is a mode of evading that service of five years?—Yes.

1254. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do I understand you to point out that the exception is limited to certain professions?—No; anybody who chooses to pass the examination and pay the 1,500 francs. The institution is supposed to be founded for the benefit of students, but anybody can take advantage of it.

1255. (*Chairman.*) To recur to the matter of distinguished conduct, you have mentioned that the Legion of Honour is freely bestowed and greatly sought. That carries with it, I believe, a small annual payment, does it not?—Yes, there are five grades, and the payment is increased at every grade.

1256. Independently of the Legion of Honour, is there any system of good-service pensions or pay?—The Medaille Militaire also carries a certain annual sum. Marshal MacMahon and General l'Admirault always wear it. It is given either to a man who has served in the ranks, or one who has commanded an army. It is given to the highest and the lowest grades.

1257. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Is it given to a general of division or general of brigade?—If a general has commanded his division before the enemy, if he has held an independent command, he may have it.

1258. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do all the privates have it?—No, it is a matter of selection.

1259. (*Chairman.*) In the case of any operations in the field, are those rewards bestowed on all who have been present if they have not fallen short of their duties, or is it merely to those who are specially distinguished?—That is all. The country votes a certain sum of money, and there are a certain number of medals, it is the men who are supposed to be the most deserving who are chosen every year as vacancies occur. All this takes place at the annual inspection of every regiment. In the French army it is once a year instead of, as with us, once in six months; and on those occasions the colonels' dossiers of the officers are gone through.

1260. And then are those rewards bestowed?—Yes.

1261. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) They are limited in number, are they not?—Yes, they are limited by money, which is voted by the country.

1262. (*Lord Hampton.*) That is according to whether they have been very meritorious?—In the field the rewards are given on the spot, and they are accounted for afterwards.

1263. You told us, I think, that there is no compulsory retirement except after the age of 62?—Just so, or for bad conduct.

1264. When you get above the rank of captain, and get into the rank of *chef de bataillon*, do many men retire out of that rank upon the *retraite*?—Then they try to hold on for lieutenant-colonel and colonel; they do not go until they cannot possibly help it.

1265. Therefore they run on until they can either get a step or arrive at the age of 62?—Yes.

1266. That is in consequence of this system, you think?—Yes.

1267. Then the retirements which are offered them in those ranks are not sufficient to attract them?—No, every man will hold on as long as he can in the hope of getting a *retraite* above that which he has in his present rank.

1268. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) How does an officer get the *retraite* when he wishes to retire?—If he has served 25 years he can ask for it, and after 25 years' service if he asks for the *retraite* he will be almost sure to get it; and at 30 years' service it cannot be refused to him.

1269. (*Chairman.*) Is he ever obliged to back his application with any medical certificate, as in the Prussian army?—No, I think not; it would strengthen his application, certainly, if he could forward a certificate to say that he was unfit for service.

1270. In point of fact, the authorities are rather glad than otherwise to get rid of him?—Yes.

1271. This system surely must result in the officers commanding regiments being very advanced in age?—Of course it does.

1272. As a rule, what would be the sort of age which you would expect to find in a man who is in command of a regiment?—I have seen plenty at 60.

1273. With regard to the majority of those with whom you have come in contact as commanding regiments, what would their age be?—There are some quite young who have been pushed on by the selection system, and there are others who have been very deserving men who have got on but slowly.

1274. Would you say that the majority of colonels succeeded in obtaining promotion before they attained this age of 62, or do the majority have to leave the army at that age with the rank of lieutenant-colonel?—I should say that the majority of the colonels of the French army commanding regiments now (I do not say that it is a very large majority) are men who had not arrived at that rank before they were between 50 and 60.

1275. (*Mr. Welby.*) Is not the retirement pension of the army a part of the debt of France; is not the budget of retired pay brought in as part of the debt?—For particulars you have to go to the Minister of Finance. The War Office tell you that those gentlemen are *en retraite*, and that they have nothing more to do with them.

1276. (*Chairman.*) Is it competent for officers to commute their pension for a lump sum of money?—I have never heard of it.

1277. With regard to the Artillery and the Engineers, do they materially differ in their organization from the Infantry and the line?—No, so far as promotion and retirement go, it is the same system of selection and seniority.

1278. Is the system generally speaking the same?—Yes. There is not so much selection in the artillery and engineers, because they are all men that must have been to the Ecôle Polytechnique; they must all have had about the same education, and I think that there is less field for selection in them than there is in the others.

1279. What is the rank of an officer of artillery who commands a field battery or a troop?—He is a captain of artillery, and he advances as *chef d'escadron* in the next rank after that.

1280. Is it not like it is in England, where all the officers are majors?—No, it is not so now.

1281. (*Lord Hampton.*) Am I right in my impression that the organization which you have now described to us in your evidence is an organization which dates from the time of Louis Philippe?—Yes, from the year 1832.

1282. Did I understand you rightly, that the organization is now throughout in a state of revision?—Perfectly so.

1283. And therefore, I presume, it is entirely uncertain, and you are unable to tell us how much of the organization which you have described will be retained after the revision has been completed?—Quite impossible, because it has to go before the National Assembly, where it will be debated next autumn.

1284. And you think that each change in this organization will not be a question determined by the military authorities of France, but will be the subject of debate in the chambers?—The military authorities will bring in a Bill, which they propose for the reorganization of the *intendance* and the staff (the others

are done), but it will of course be subject to a debate, and possible alteration.

1285. Living very much as you do with the French army, I presume that all those changes have been the subject of discussion and conversation amongst them?—Yes.

1286. Are you disposed to believe, from all that you have heard, that the changes in this organization will be very extensive?—Certainly.

1287. And can you at all indicate to us what portion of the organization which you have described is likely to be changed and how?—No, I really could not.

1288. For instance, compared with our own army, you would feel that a battalion of 328 men is a very small battalion?—Yes.

1289. Do you think that there is likely to be any change in respect to the organization of the regiment?—Certainly not; that will not be changed. I went through three series of autumn manœuvres with the French army this year, and we never had a battalion out of more than 300 men.

1290. Do you think that it is a good military arrangement to have the battalions so small?—They can fill them up very soon from the reserves and the territorial army which is now being organised.

1291. I understood you to say that with the organization of 82 men to a company, the system of the French army is invariably to have three officers to every company?—Yes; but to that number, on the war establishment, another officer and five more non-commissioned officers are added.

1292. Are you yourself conversant with the organization of the Prussian army?—No; I was attached to a German army in 1866, but only for so short a time that I cannot give any information that would be of service to the Commission.

1293. You are not aware that the proportion of the officers which you describe in the French army is very much larger than it is in the German army?—I have always heard so.

1294. And it is also larger than it is in our English army, is it not?—Yes; they are supposed to have one more lieutenant added to each of the companies; when the regiment amounts to 3,000 men, which it will do on the war establishment, the regiment is to have four battalions and the whole regiment is to be 3,000 men under the new law.

1295. The regiment of four battalions which you have described to us amounts to 1,312 men; in the case of the French army being increased to the war establishment, do I understand you that a regiment would be more than 3,000?—Yes, it will be 3,000 rank and file.

1296. But the interior organization, as I understand you, would remain the same?—There would be extra lieutenants added to them; that would make four officers per company.

1297. What would the company be increased to?—I understand there would still be four battalions, and each of those battalions would have four companies just as much as in the peace establishment?—Yes.

1298. Would the number of field officers be increased?—No.

1299. There still would be only one colonel or lieutenant-colonel?—Yes. There would be the colonel and lieutenant-colonel.

1300. And one *chef de bataillon* to each battalion?—Yes.

1301. But there would be one subaltern added to each company?—Yes; I think the company would be about 175 men, if I remember rightly.

1302. At all events there would be one subaltern added, but that would be the only change in the state of the regiment, and the non-commissioned officers would be increased in proportion?—Each company would on the war establishment receive an extra lieutenant *au titre auxiliaire*. There would be also added one corporal "fourrier," four sergeants, eight corporals, and two drummers, or buglers. They exist only on paper at this moment, but they will be drawn from the reserves.

1303. I did not quite understand your description of the rank of *gros major* to each regiment; if I understand you rightly to describe the duties they would seem rather to be in the nature of civil duties?—He is at the head of everything which is non-combatant, and he has under him various officers as assistants. He superintends everything which our quartermasters would do. He is answerable for all the non-combatant department of the regiment.

1304. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) During the war he remains with the depôt, does he not?—Yes; he remains with the depôt in time of war.

1305. (*Lord Hampton.*) If I understand you, it is a military appointment with civil duties?—Yes; with non-combatant duties, I should say.

1306. You described to us that after the rank of colonel there are generals of brigade and generals of division; is that the only division of the rank of general, or is there anything in the French army corresponding to our three ranks of major-general, lieutenant-general, and full general?—There is no full general in the French army.

1307. And there is no major-general, I believe?—The major-general in England corresponds to the *général de brigade*.

1308. But supposing that a general of brigade ceases from any cause to command a brigade, what would be his army rank?—A *général de brigade*.

1309. A *général de brigade* is in fact a title, and it is a rank?—Yes, it is a rank in France.

1310. You said that a general of division of course is an officer commanding a division, but in several of your garrisons you have told us that there is more than one division, and in that case who commands the combined division?—The senior general. General l'Admirault has several divisions under him, but he is the senior, and the generals commanding them are under his orders.

1311. In a garrison town I understand your answer to be, that the divisions are commanded by the senior general of division, and that there is no French rank rising above that of general of division?—Except that of marshal.

1312. As I understand you, there is no rank above general except that of marshal?—None except the marshals who had been appointed under the Empire. The Republic does not I believe recognise the rank of marshal.

1313. Speaking generally, could you tell us what proportion of the captains in a regiment or battalion are men who have risen from the ranks?—I should think there are about two to one who have risen from the ranks.

1314. Therefore, two thirds in any battalion are probably men who have risen from the ranks?—Yes, and I base my opinion upon what I observe of the style of the men, as I mix a great deal with them.

1315. Do the captains, when they accept their *retraite*, and are retired, retain in civil life their rank of captain?—They are always called so.

1316. How are the men selected from the ranks?—They are recommended by the colonel of the regiment.

1317. Are there cases of captains promoted from the ranks who do reach the rank of *chef de bataillon*?—Certainly, but I do not think there are many exclusive of the gentlemen who have voluntarily enlisted.

1318. Is there any considerable proportion of the men who are promoted from the ranks,—men who have been rejected from Saint Cyr?—It would be impossible to tell how many.

1319. Is it not proper to consider that a proportion of men promoted from the ranks have been rejected from Saint Cyr?—A man who had educated himself to pass at Saint Cyr, and who failed, and who then went into the army as private would have an infinitely better chance of being promoted officer than a ploughman or a weaver, or any men of that class whom he finds himself alongside of, because he has had an in-

Col. Conolly,
19 April 1875.

finitely better eudcation than those men, although he has failed at Saint Cyr.

1320. You have no means of knowing what proportion of promotions from the ranks are men who have been rejected at Saint Cyr, but do you think that probably a considerable proportion of them would have been so?—I have no doubt that a considerable proportion of the men who fail at Saint Cyr, and go into the ranks, arrive at the grade of officer, because they have had a much better education than the common classes that they are alongside of.

1321. Is there any well organized system of education for officers of the French Army?—Now there are schools formed (all that is quite new,) not only for officers, but for non-commisioned officers and for men also, that has been going on for the last two years. I have seen several that are established in the camps.

1322. I presume that the system was commenced since the war with Germany?—Yes, certainly; I do not believe it existed before.

1323. Combined with that, is there at present any system of examination of the officers before they can be promoted from one rank to another?—I believe there is going to be one, but I do not think it is in operation yet.

1324. Is there any examination before a man can enter the army as an officer?—He must have come from a school if he goes in as an officer.

1325. Do you mean that he must have done so?—Yes.

1326. As I understand there are two roads into the army as an officer, namely, either from the school or from the ranks?—Exactly so.

1327. Are there at present practically competitive examinations for getting into the college at Saint Cyr?—Yes, certainly.

1328. Does an officer who is promoted from the ranks undergo any examination before he is allowed to have his commission?—No, certainly not.

1329. (*Chairman.*) Do all those who succeed in getting a sub-lieutenancy at the college, as a matter of course get a commission?—Yes, I think so. They may have to wait, but all those who come out of Saint Cyr with a certificate must be provided for.

1330. (*Lord Hampton.*) I understood you to say that under the conscription system of 1873 there is no system by which a person drawn for service can get a substitute, except that which you have described to us, by paying 1,500 francs?—There is no substitute allowed.

1331. Everybody is hit?—Yes; everybody is hit.

1332. But everybody does not serve?—No; because they cannot afford to keep under arms the whole youth of every year, and those who want to make sure of getting off with one year go in as volunteers, having paid the 1,500 francs.

1333. With the present population of France, they do not find it necessary to make every man that is drawn serve?—No; every man goes up, and they take those whom they may want to put under the colours at once for the five years, the others are sent back to their homes, where they are drilled by the reserves.

1334. They all serve, do they not, in one way or other?—Yes.

1335. As to the *médaille militaire*, did I understand you to say that no officer is allowed to have that medal unless he has had a command in a field?—An independent command. Of course; every officer who had got it when he was in the ranks continues to wear it as an officer, but as an officer he cannot get it unless he has held an independent command.

1336. But by the officers is it a decoration which is very highly prized?—Yes.

1337. No officer is allowed to have it, except as you have mentioned, but it is given to privates?—Yes; it is given to non-commissioned officers and men in the ranks.

1338. Then, as it is an unusual thing and therefore must be given to very many men who have not served in the field, how do they regulate what men who have served in the field shall have it; supposing an army is in the field, it is not given to every one in that army, is it?—No; there are a certain number, I do not know how many per annum, but the country votes a certain sum of money for the *médaille militaire*, and as far as that money will hold out they are distributed.

1339. And the number would be more or less, would it not, according to whether it is in time of war or peace?—It depends upon the antecedent budget which is voted by the assembly.

1340. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) On the same principle as our good conduct or distinguished service pay?—Yes.

1341. (*Lord Hampton.*) What is the organization of the cavalry?—The squadron is the unit. It is commanded by a first captain; that is the new system.

1342. Does the organization of the cavalry consist in the first place of the regiment?—Yes.

1343. How is the regiment subdivided; is there anything corresponding to the battalion?—Each regiment has six squadrons. I take a regiment of Chasseurs d'Afrique.

1344. Of what strength?—163 men and 148 horses. The Committee will remember that this is the peace number.

1345. Then there is nothing corresponding to an infantry battalion?—Nothing nearer to the squadron. There are six squadrons to a regiment.

1346. What officers are there to each squadron?—First captain, second captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and sub-lieutenant,—five officers.

1347. And what field officers to the whole regiment?—Colonel, lieutenant-colonel, three *chefs d'escadron* and the *gros major*.

1348. The organization, in fact, comes to this, that there are two squadrons under each *chef d'escadron*? Yes, each *chef d'escadron* has two squadrons under him.

1349. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Upon what principle are the promotions from the ranks worked; is a certain number of officers taken from the ranks, or is it left to the colonel to say who shall be promoted?—The colonel makes his recommendation to the general at his inspection, and all this has to be settled by the Commission that sits in Paris.

1350. Is there a definite proportion of officers who are taken from the ranks, or is it an arbitrary number? It is arbitrary.

1351. It is, therefore, in the breast of the colonel to make recommendations or not?—Yes.

1352. If he chooses to say, "I want to have a certain man for promotion in my regiment," what takes place then?—The general commanding would say, "You must give your reason"; but there are no rules for that.

1353. But there is a definite expectation, is there not, that a certain number will be promoted from the ranks?—Yes.

1354. Are those selected by their being the best men?—They are supposed to be the best men.

1355. And usually from the non-commissioned officers?—Yes, from the non-commissioned officers.

1356. One result, as I understand from you, is that officers in the ranks of captain are often grey-headed men, and rather past the work of a captain?—Many of them are.

1357. And it is this advance of officers in that rank that has led to dissatisfaction on the part of the military authorities with the constitution of the French army?—Yes.

1358. Is there any limit of age as to the selection of a man from the ranks to become an officer?—No, I believe not; but there is always the age of 62 staring them in the face.

1359. Is it your opinion that the efficiency of the French army is materially injured by the age to which the officers are allowed to go on serving?—Yes, decidedly.

1360. If you had to constitute an army yourself, you would endeavour to provide that a colonel should

not continue in command of his regiment up to so great an age as 62?—I think that would be desirable; I think it is too old for a man to be in regimental service.

1361. Are the students at Saint Cyr maintained by the State?—It is a Government institution. The pupils pay a certain sum, but it is a moderate one.

1362. So that persons who are not in very wealthy circumstances can go there?—Yes, perfectly easily; Also the sons of officers are admitted, under very favourable conditions.

1363. That school dates from the time of the Revolution, does it not?—Yes, I believe it has been in existence the whole of the century.

1364. Do you know what class of people compete for entrance; are they of all ranks socially, or is it confined to the better class?—It must confine itself naturally to people who can afford to give their sons a good education, because the examination for entrance is very strict.

1365. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) They pay for their education there, do they not?—Yes, to a certain extent. There are exceptions made in favour of certain persons.

1366. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is there any rule in the French service about the selection of officers for the staff?—It is an entirely separate corps.

1367. So that there is a separate education for it?—Yes, it is a separate corps altogether; but there is great dissatisfaction in the French army with regard to the staff corps.

1368. When a man gets upon the *état major* he generally remains there, does he not?—Yes.

1369. And he becomes a colonel after a time?—Yes, and from that he passes to a general of brigade.

1370. Then, of course, he steps over the heads of other officers?—Yes, it is one of the ways of getting on in the French army, but there has always been a great deal of discontent about it. Since the last war there is a very large party, not only in the army but in the country, who are for going upon the principle that officers who belong to the staff must do a great deal more regimental duty than they have hitherto done.

1371. In the case that when a man gets on the staff, he remains there for the rest of his service?—Yes.

1372. So that a very promising young officer, who has great ability for staff service, if he happens to be on regimental duty, has no chance of getting on the staff?—No, it is a regular corps.

1373. Are they selected by the War Office, or how, for the staff?—Yes, they are selected first of all, and enter the staff. They go through a course of education for it. This system will undoubtedly undergo great changes.

1374. Is that in the *Écôle Polytechnique*?—A man may have been at the *Écôle Polytechnique* and be put into the staff, or he may have been at Saint Cyr, and be put into the staff, but it cannot and it does not give him a claim.

1375. Practically, as I understand you, there is very little interchange between the staff and the army at large?—None, you may say; but all that will be very shortly altered. A bill is already prepared which will come before the assembly next autumn.

1376. I suppose you have a general acquaintance with the organization of the German army?—A very general acquaintance indeed.

1377. Is it enough to enable you to say whether the general arrangements of promotion in the French army are an imitation of the arrangements of the German army?—The whole system of recruitment is, you may say, a copy of it.

1378. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Brigades and divisions are open, are they not, to the officers of the staff whom you have described?—Yes.

1379. How long is a general of brigade allowed to exercise that command?—There is no reason why he should not go on until he is 62. There is no limit until then.

1380. Is there any limit to the command of a regiment?—62.

1381. Speaking of promotion from the ranks, you said, I think, that there was no limit whatever in reference to age beyond which a man is ineligible for promotion?—At 62 he would not be eligible.

1382. Are you under the impression that the present tendency on the part of the Government is to discourage promotion from the ranks?—Certainly.

1383. From a feeling that it has failed?—From a feeling that they get a very uneducated set of men, and that they get them too old.

1384. Saint Cyr is only intended, I believe, for the education of cavalry and infantry officers?—Yes, that is so.

1385. Where are the ordnance officers educated?—At the Écôle Polytechnique, as are also young men for certain civil services, for instance the *Ponts et Chaussées*. It is not entirely like Woolwich.

1386. Is the rate of promotion in the ordnance corps, generally speaking, equal to that in the line?—As far as I can see by the appearance of the men it certainly is. I think that the officers are just as young men.

1387. The organization of the peace establishment readily admits of expansion to the war establishment, does it not?—Yes. This has been the principal object of the new law.

1388. The principle upon which it is formed is that the *câdres* admit of expansion?—Yes, from economical motives the regiment is kept at the lowest strength compatible with efficiency, but with facilities for expanding it quickly.

1389. Did I understand you rightly just now, in answer to Mr. Welby that the non-effective charges of the French army, that is the retirement, pensions, and all that, do not appear in the military estimates at all?—When I went to inquire about them at the War Office they sent me to the Ministry of Finance, and that is where I got them from.

1390. If say 15 millions sterling in round numbers is voted for the army that does not include the non-effective charges?—No, I should think not, certainly.

1391. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) You are aware that during the time of the empire, lieutenant-colonels were obliged to retire at 58, captains at 53, and lieutenants at 52; when was that rule changed?—I was not there at the time. It must have been changed during the war or immediately after it, because I arrived there directly after the war.

1392. Could you furnish a return showing the number of officers who become field officers out of 1,000 officers who enter the army, and an explanation of what becomes of those who do not attain that rank?—I should have to ask the French for it.

1393. You have stated that an officer arrives at the rank of *chef de bataillon* after 20 years' service, and that seniority is the rule, could you give us any idea of what becomes of the other 54 officers that must retire before that officer can become a *chef de bataillon*?—The gensdarmerie, to begin with, absorbs a great many officers in the French service who are not supposed to get beyond the rank of captain. Also I know that a captain or a *chef d'escadron* is very glad to be made superintendent of a railway station of a very moderate size. I know several retired *chefs d'escadron* who are in charge of railway stations not so large as the station at Aldershot. When officers of these ranks have families, and can obtain the highest scale of "*retraite*" they expect, they are only too delighted to fall back upon a railway station. In the law of 1873, which came out the other day, a number of civil appointments are reserved for military men, so as to cause promotion in the regiments.

1394. (*Chairman.*) These must be Government civil appointments, must they not?—Yes, but the Government has a great deal to do with almost every railroad in France.

1395. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is it a fact that a large number of French officers consider that there should be two captains in each company?—Yes, when it was proposed that a company should number 250 men.

1396. That was a very popular arrangement with the French army, was it not?—Yes, it would have made a great deal of promotion.

1397. (*Mr. Welby.*) I think you have told the Commission that the Minister of War has the power of making an exception in the case of an officer arriving at the fatal age of 62 or 65?—He has in the case of a general of division. A general of brigade is supposed to go at the age of 62, and I have never heard of there being an exception.

1398. In case he does make an exception, does he put the reason for the exception upon record in any form?—Yes, at that Commission that I have told you of, which meets at the Ministry of War in the month of January, when all *tableaux d'avancement* are taken into consideration.

1399. It is not at the mere whim of the Minister of War?—No, it is not supposed to be so at any rate.

1400. You were telling us of a great number of those grey-headed captains that were at the head of the list in each regiment; are those captains contented to remain where they are, or are they a source of great discontent in the regiment?—Most of them, I think, feel perfectly that they are not qualified for any higher position.

1401. They are not anxious to retire?—No, they will stay on as long as they possibly can in the service with the prospect of getting something, such as the superintendence of a railway station or a "collectorship" in the Department of Finance many of which are reserved for retired military officers.

1402. In France there are many more opportunities of that sort than in this country owing to the tobacco cultivation?—Yes, the *bureaux de tabac* stand often in the French army in lieu of pensions to widows.

1403. Is there any agitation going on for an increase of the retiring allowance amongst the officers?—They would be very glad to get it if they could; they consider themselves very low paid.

1404. I think I understood you to say in answer to the noble chairman that you knew of nothing in France like the system of commutation of pensions?—No, I never heard of such a thing.

1405. (*Lord Hampton.*) They are underpaid and low pensioned you think?—As regards non-commissioned officers there is a great difficulty threatening the French army; the men will not stay on beyond their five years because intelligent and tolerably well educated men can get so much greater advantages in civil than they can in military life.

1406. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) As they are being now paid are not the generals of a *corps d'armée* far better paid than any generals in other countries?—I think when you have passed the rank of *chef d'escadron* the French army is better paid than ours; but the lower ranks are miserably paid.

1407. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) You said, did you not, that in your opinion two thirds of the regimental officers rose from the ranks?—To look at them I should say so.

1408. Is it the case that a great number of young men of good social position enter the service as privates with a wish to become officers, and by supplying themselves with their own clothes and not throwing much expense upon the State they have the position of cadets, and associate with the officers and not with the men?—No. The one-year-volunteers are the nearest approach to this.

1409. (*Chairman.*) I see in the paper furnished to the Commission by the War Office that the retiring pension of a captain at its maximum after 50 years' service, campaigns included, is 64*l.* a year. Would that be correct?—I know that this is all founded upon official documents received from the French finance.

1410. So that we may take it as correct?—Yes.

1411. A *chef de bataillon*, or major, as we should call him, has 80*l.* a year?—Yes.

1412. A lieutenant-colonel's retiring pension is stated as 96*l.* a year?—Yes.

1413. And a colonel's as 120*l.* a year?—Yes.

1414. A major-general has 160*l.*?—Yes.

1415. And a lieutenant-general or general of division 240*l.*?—Yes.

1416. Those sums are exclusive of any amount that the officer may receive as belonging to the Legion of Honour?—Yes.

1417. And the rates of the Legion of Honour are for companions 10*l.* a year, officers 20*l.*, commanders 40*l.*, grand officers 80*l.*, and grand crosses 120*l.*?—

1418. What is the highest pay of a colonel of cavalry?—393*l.*

1419. And the highest pay of a colonel of infantry?—369*l.*

1420. What is the highest pay of a lieutenant-colonel of cavalry?—309*l.*

1421. And of infantry?—288*l.*

1422. What is the highest pay of a major of cavalry?—265*l.*

1423. And of infantry?—244*l.*

1424. What is the highest pay of a first captain?—175*l.* in the cavalry and in the infantry 166*l.*

1425. What is the highest pay of a second captain of cavalry?—163*l.* and in the infantry 154*l.*

1426. What does a first lieutenant of cavalry receive?—133*l.* and in the infantry 123*l.*

1427. A second lieutenant of cavalry receives how much?—129*l.* and in the infantry 119*l.*

1428. And a sub-lieutenant?—123*l.* in the cavalry and in the infantry 115*l.*

1429. Those sums are the pay of officers in Paris, are they not?—Yes.

1430. Which is higher than the pay in the provinces?—Yes, because their expenses are higher.

1431. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Is that inclusive of allowances?—No, I think that is only the pay.

1432. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Every officer in the French army receives an allowance for his barrack?—Yes, they get an allowance according to their rank for finding lodgings, over and above their pay; they do not live in barracks, only the adjutant lives there.

1433. (*Chairman.*) Is the pay that you have just given exclusive of allowances?—Those rates include lodging money, but nothing else. They have their coals and candles, forage for horses, and servants, and so on.

1434. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) And a French officer is allowed to go to the theatre at one-fourth of the general price?— In fact I may say that they get their theatre, their railroads, and their tobacco at much cheaper rates.

1435. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) They pay nothing like income tax, I imagine?—No.

1436. (*Chairman.*) Generally speaking, without going into detail, it would appear that the pensions are very small as compared with their full pay?—Yes, certainly.

1437. Does that account, do you think, for the circumstance that they hold on in the way that you have described?—Undoubtedly, and they also will hold on in the hope, as I have said before, of getting a railway appointment or an appointment in the finance, or some other appointment of that description.

1438. I think you said that the pension rules were considerable illiberal by the French army?—Decidedly so.

1439. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do you think it likely that the system of pensions will be revised?—I have no doubt about it; in fact, it is under revision at this moment.

1440. (*Chairman.*) It is pretty plain that no man will take advantage of the retirement that can possibly help it?—No, certainly not.

1441. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Are there not some barracks that are furnished, because I remember perfectly well being on a committee on barrack accommodation, of which Lord Monck was the chairman, and we had evidence produced before us actually giving the size of every table, the number of chairs, and the size of the looking-glasses for every rank in

the French army?—That is in a fortress, but not in common country quarters; they get so much to find their lodging.

1442. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You stated just now that in the higher ranks when a man became general he had very superior pay indeed?—Yes, including his allowances, because they are very liberal in the higher grades.

1443. Do you think from your knowledge of the circumstances that there is any army commander in France to whom the pay is inadequate, and that whether in command of a garrison, or an army corps, or a division, or a brigade, the pay he receives must necessarily be supplemented by his private means?—No, I think that a general officer in command either of a division, a military district, or a fortress, has allowances that he can very well live upon.

1444. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) An officer commanding a cavalry regiment is allowed, is he not, to drive troopers in his carriage?—There are a certain number of troopers in every cavalry regiment told off for harness, and the officer commanding uses them much as he pleases.

1445–56. He is allowed a sum also for receptions, and for great parties, is he not?—Yes; generally the officers of high rank in the French army are very well paid, and the lower ranks very badly.

The witness withdrew.

Major-General J. W. Armstrong, C.B., examined.

1457. (*Chairman.*) You hold the appointment of Deputy Adjutant-General to the Forces?—Yes.

1458. Have you seen the paper which we have submitted to some of the gentlemen who have been good enough to give us the benefit of their evidence?—Yes, I have had a copy of it.

1459. The first question upon which we should like to have the benefit of your advice is as to the system of promotion, whether it should be by seniority, tempered of course by selection, but as a general rule in times of peace by seniority?—It should be by seniority, tempered of course by selection.

1460. By seniority do you understand seniority in the regiment, or seniority in the army?—Seniority in the regiment.

1461. Do you apply that remark to every grade in the regiment, from the lowest up to the highest?—Yes.

1462. What do you say of the inequalities in the rapidity of promotion which would be sure to result from that system, that is to say, the fact that the men in one regiment would be likely to get their promotion at a much earlier age than the men in another regiment; do you think that that is a great evil?—No, I do not. I think it is unavoidable; it is the fortune of war. Some officers get their promotion quicker than others, but I do not think the system works unsatisfactorily.

1463. Do you think that the circumstance is one that creates any very great dissatisfaction amongst the officers?—No, I think not.

1464. Do you approve of the idea of any limit of age or of years' service being fixed, after which a man should not be allowed to advance to any particular grade, say the grade of major?—I think there should be a limit, perhaps not so much of age, because age sometimes is not a fair criterion of either intellectual or physical vigour, but I think that a man ought not to be promoted to the rank of regimental major after 30 years' service except with a view to his immediately retiring.

1465. That is to say you would give him a step in rank and then retire him?—Yes.

1466. But for the purpose of active service you would be unwilling that he should accede to the rank of major after 30 years' service?—Yes.

1467. Would you make the same remark with reference to a lieutenant-colonel?—I think that a man should not be promoted to lieutenant-colonel, except, perhaps, with the view of retiring immediately, after he has attained the age of 60.

1468. That is a somewhat advanced age for the command of a regiment, is it not?—I say except with the view of retirement, not for the purpose of serving.

1469. What age would you consider would be the most desirable age at which, for the benefit of the service, a man should succeed to the command of a regiment?—In some cases you cannot go by age, but from 35 to 40 on the average is a very good age to accede to the command. I think that period is the best time of a man's life for command.

1470. The duties that are required of an officer commanding a regiment imply, do they not, a certain amount of physical activity in case of war?—Certainly, and even in time of peace.

1471. With regard to promotion, which you say you think ought to be by seniority, as a rule, what method would you say would be desirable to regulate selection; or is there any system on which you would proceed in the exercise of the discretion of selection in regimental appointments?—The selection should be made in the regiment by the reports which the general commander-in-chief has in his possession, and failing there being any officer sufficiently competent for promotion, then the selection should be made out of the regiment; but I can hardly think that such a case would exist.

1472. Would you say that if there was a vacancy in the majority, and the senior captain was not a fit man, all things being considered, to take the vacant place, it would desirable to take the next captain in the regiment?—Yes.

1473. Rather than taking a man out of the regiment?—Yes, provided he was competent.

1474. Then you would put one man over the other man's head in his own regiment?—Yes, certainly.

1475. Would that not create more dissatisfaction than if you had brought in a man from some other regiment?—I think not; it would create dissatisfaction in the individual passed over, and the fact of his being passed over would probably lead to his retirement.

1476. Do you think it ought to lead to his retirement?—I think so, certainly. I think it would create less dissatisfaction if the second captain were promoted than if a stranger were brought in.

1477. What is your opinion of those confidential reports which we understand are now in full force in the army; do you think that they are to be relied upon as a rule, or do they come under your consideration at all?—No, they do not come under my consideration, but I have seen some of them, and I should say from the few that I have seen that they ought, if honestly and conscientiously prepared, to fulfil the object of informing the commander-in-chief of the merits and qualifications of the different officers.

1478. From your experience of the army are you able to say whether those reports are the cause of much uneasiness and dissatisfaction among the officers in a regiment; I mean between the commanding officer who has to report and the officers who have to be reported upon?—I have never heard such complaints made, but I do not say that they do not exist.

1479. Do you agree with what has been told us by some others that it is desirable that when those reports are made they should be communicated if they are derogatory to the individual who is reported upon at the time when they are made?—I think they ought to be communicated to him within a given time, perhaps after they have been before His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief.

1480. Either at that time or at the time that they are made?—Yes, or very shortly afterwards, on the

Maj.-Gen. Armstrong.

19 April 1875.

principle that I think it unfair that a man should be reported upon without knowing that he has been reported upon unfavourably.

1481. Those reports, we are told, form the basis upon which the commander-in-chief may reject a man whose seniority would otherwise entitle him to the post?—Yes.

1482. Is there any other system which has occurred to your mind by which any young men of special merit might obtain quicker promotion in a regiment than would fall to their lot otherwise?—I do not know of any; not in the regiment.

1483. Would it be desirable to lay down a rule that those who had passed the staff college should get a quicker promotion on that account?—No, I think not.

1484. Or those who have had a certain amount of foreign service as contrasted with home service?—No, I think not.

1485. You would not create any distinction of that kind?—No, I would not create any such distinction.

1486. But subject to details as exemplified in these reports you would allow the appointments to go by regimental seniority?—Yes, by regimental seniority certainly.

1487. You would make no difference between one rank and another, but would carry out the principle right through up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel?—Right through the regiment.

1488. With reference to the staff, is it your opinion that it is desirable that officers who have already obtained experience on the staff should be re-appointed on the staff, or on the other hand do you think that it would be desirable, speaking of the general rule, that some fresh officer should be appointed in order to disseminate more widely the information that is to be obtained by so serving?—I think, as a general rule, that as much fresh blood as possible should be brought in, but of course there are certain appointments where it might be necessary to grant a renewal of the appoinment to the officer holding it, but that would be for the commander-in-chief to judge.

1489. But as a rule are you in favor of splitting up the appointments more widely among the army than would be done if re-appointment was the rule?—Yes.

1490. What do you say upon the subject of brevet; is the brevet system, in your opinion, an entirely satisfactory one?—I think not quite so. I think it is an anomalous mode of promotion, but I really do not see how we can do without it, we have had it so long.

1491. We are told that the chief anomaly and evil of it is that a man may be a brevet-colonel, and higher in rank than the colonel commanding his regiment, and yet be serving in his regiment as captain?—Yes, that has happened.

1492. And things of that sort happen not unfrequently, do they not?—Not unfrequently.

1493. And there is a want of harmony sometimes produced by it, is there not?—There is a want of harmony produced. I do not know that very many instances have occurred of want of harmony, but it might exist, and awkwardness no doubt has existed.

1494. What are the benefits which you consider we get from the system of brevet?—The benefit is that young officers who have distinguished themselves are rewarded for service in the field, and have their promotion accelerated to a higher rank generally by it.

1495. That is the single benefit of it, is it not, that it is one method of rewarding distinguished service?—Yes, of rewarding distinguished service in the field.

1496. With regard to the establishment of general officers, are you satisfied with the system under which promotion to the rank of general officer is managed?—I think that there might be some improvement made in the present fixed establishment of general officers.

1497. In what direction?—First by having two classes.

1498. That means by adding to the number of general officers, does it not?—I mean that there should be an establishment for general officers who are capable and fit for employment, while others who are not, and who, probably from age or other circumstances, would never be, able to serve actively should be placed on a separate list.

1499. How would you discriminate between the two classes; on what system would you arrange the officers?—You might make an active list and a retired list.

1500. And on what principle would you carry out the division between the active and the retired lists?—I think that those who should be placed upon the retired list should be officers who had not served actively for some time, and who probably had obtained no higher rank regimentally than major, and who had never acquired the command of a regiment, or held a relative staff appointment; I think that such officers should be placed upon the retired list.

1501. Can a man now become only a major and not command a regiment, and yet become a general officer?—Yes.

1502. How is he qualified to be a general officer?—He is qualified by having served as a substantive field officer, as a brevet lieutenant-colonel, but he may never have commanded a regiment. There are cases now, I believe, on the list who have so qualified.

1503. He must be a brevet lieutenant-colonel and he must have served eight years as a field officer?—Yes, he must have served eight years as a field officer, if he is in the rank of a major, or five years as commander of a regiment.

1504. In the case of those officers who have never commanded a regiment, you would put them aside as a class who might go on the retired list?—Yes.

1505. What would be your next class?—I think age.

1506. You mean that after passing a certain age they should pass on to the retired list?—Yes, officers who are known to be really so infirm that they cannot be capable of performing the duties of their regiment.

1507. That is to say, officers who are pointed out by the commander-in-chief as being unfit for duty?—Yes. I think that our fixed establishment is rather overloaded with general officers; although I should be very sorry to say anything or to recommend any injury to those holding the rank; still such a plan as suggested might be adopted.

1508. How would you deal with that retired list with regard to the honorary colonels; would you allow them to remain open to the retired list?—I think officers on the retired list who have distinguished themselves might be appointed honorary colonels, but not officers who have seen no service in the field, or who have been a long time without active employment.

1509. Having divided the list in the way you have described, would you fill up the list of those who are taken off the active list and put on to the retired list by such means?—Yes.

1510. That would amount to an increase in the fixed establishment, would it not?—Yes.

1511. As a mode of creating a flow of promotion?—Yes.

1512. Is it your opinion that it is very undesirable that a lieutenant-colonel, after ceasing to command his regiment, should remain for any number of years on half-pay before he becomes a general?—I think it is undesirable.

1513. With regard to those officers who, having commanded a regiment, could not have employment found for them, and therefore who would be obliged to live out of employent on half-pay, do you think that it would be undesirable that they should remain in that condition for some years and then become general officers?—I think so.

1514. In order to avoid that, do you think that any system of offering a liberal retirement to a man who had ceased to command his regiment would be effective?—I think it might be.

1515. And of course adding to the general officers' list in the way which you have described would be in

the same direction ?—Yes, it would be in the same direction certainly.

1516. What pension by way of retirement do you think would tempt a person in the position that I have mentioned, namely that of a lieutenant-colonel, who had ceased to command his regiment ?—Perhaps the same amount as he would receive as a general officer on the unattached list, 25*s.* a day. I think that if that sum, combined with a step in honorary rank, were offered to a man who had no desire probably to serve actively it might be an inducement to him to make way for others.

1517. You mean that a lieutenant-colonel on retiring would probably rather receive the pay of a major-general at once than remain on half-pay and wait until in his turn he took his place on the fixed establishment ?—Yes, and having at once the distinction of the honorary rank of general.

1518. If a liberal retirement were offered to a lieutenant-colonel in the position that I have mentioned and it was desirable to relieve the list of those who were coming forward to be generals, would you approve of retirement being made compulsory ?—I do not think I should like to make it compulsory.

1519. Do you mean without reference to age or service ?—Yes.

1520. What do you think of the present rule of a lieutenant-colonel holding his commission only for five years, and a major the same, do you think that that is a rule which should be maintained with the view of creating promotion ?—I do not approve of a man being removed at the end of five years as a rule, but I think that the commander-in-chief might exercise his discretion in making a man go, or causing him to retire, if he had not made any special mark as a commanding officer.

1521. It has been pointed out to the commission that the rule being that a man should retire, unless re-appointed that rule gives the commander-in-chief an opportunity of failing to re-appoint that man if he does not think him specially fitted, and in that aspect you approve of it ?—Yes, I approve of it, but I think that retirement after five years would deprive us of some of our very best commanding officers, if it were made compulsory, which I should object to.

1522. Looked at in the aspect of the officer, and also of his efficiency, you would say it was undesirable to remove him ?—Yes.

1523. What do you say to the rule looked at from the other side, namely, as a method of procuring promotion for those below, because unless some removal is made in the ranks above those below must stagnate ?—Quite so.

1524. And of the two evils which is the greater think you ?—I prefer not compelling a man to retire after five years, provided he has shown himself thoroughly fit for his duties.

1525. Perhaps you are not aware of the average number of years that a man has held the command of a regiment under the purchase system ?—I am not.

1526. I believe it is about 6½ years. Speaking now of the line, was it or not the constant habit under the purchase system for a lieutenant-colonel to leave the command of his regiment and go on half-pay with a view of getting his over-regulation money ?—Yes, I believe so.

1527. He would take his over-regulation money and go on half-pay ?—Yes, I believe so.

1528. That was a great inducement, was it not ?—Yes, probably.

1529. In the cavalry regiments and in the guards, where the over-regulation pay was a very heavy sum of money, it became a very great inducement, did it not ?—Yes, a very great inducement indeed, there is no doubt of it.

1530. That inducement would no longer exist in the army as now constituted ?—No.

1531. Therefore it would seem that, unless some means were taken to induce a lieutenant-colonel to retire from the command of his regiment, he would be likely to stay on for a considerable time ?—Yes, that is true ; but some other inducement should be held out.

1532. How would you deal with that difficulty, because if he stays there he must block the way for others ?—I am not prepared to say how that might be dealt with.

1533. Now going to the ranks below that of major ; under the present rule you see a lieutenant-colonel could hold a commission in the first instance for five years as major ?—Yes.

1534. Supposing that that rule is rigidly maintained, what do you think would be the best mode of dealing with the major ; would you put him on half-pay, or would you offer him a retirement to leave the army ?—I should be inclined to offer him a retirement to leave the army.

1535. Do you feel a difficulty in allowing a number of majors to be thrown out of their regiments by the operation of this rule, and keeping them on half-pay ?—Yes.

1536. Generally speaking, do you think that the system of being on half-pay is a desirable one if it can be avoided ?—I think it is very undesirable, except of course in cases where an officer's health has suffered. It is very inconvenient I think.

1537. With regard to the best methods of procuring retirement you are aware that under the purchase system a very large number of officers retired, selling out as it was called in the lower ranks of subalterns and captains ?—Yes.

1538. Do you think it would be desirable to institute any system under which retirement should be effected in those ranks now ?—I think that in the rank of captain men who have attained a certain term of service might have an inducement by the offer of a liberal retirement to retire and leave the army, so as to accelerate promotion.

1539. Have you any sum of money in your mind that you could give the Commission as what you think a proper sum ?—I do not think that an officer should be placed in much worse circumstances than he would be if he remained in the regiment, that is, he should receive his full pay and probably some remuneration for what he would lose by the loss of his quarters and allowances generally.

1540. You think that a pension calculated on the value of his full pay and his allowances should be offered to him after a certain number of years' service ?—Yes.

1541. What number of years would you fix upon for that ?—From 20 to 25 years' service for a captain.

1542. Would you be opposed to the project of offering a voluntary retirement to anybody below that rank for length of service ?—I do not think I would go beyond the rank of captain.

1543. A vast number did retire as lieutenants under the purchase system, did they not ?—Yes, I believe so.

1544. What would be your reasons for not going below the rank of captain ?—Probably it would not be worth a man's while to accept the retirement to which lieutenants might probably be entitled to, and he might stop in the hope of some promotion hereafter.

1545. You must bear in mind that he would be younger and more able to enter upon some other employment of life ?—Yes, that is true.

1546. But without asking you to speculate upon the extent to which this retirement might be accepted, would you see any objection to that being proposed ?—No, I think not. I think any scheme with the view of accelerating promotion is very desirable.

1547. With the view of receiving a sum of money which might suit the circumstances of some individuals even if it did not suit the whole class ?—I see no objection to that whatever. I think it would be a desirable plan.

1548. Have you had an opportunity of judging whether the class of officers that are coming into the army now under the competitive system are different from those that have been in the army hitherto ?—I do not think, from what I have seen, there is much difference ; it is a mere matter of opinion, but I con-

Maj.-Gen. Armstrong.

19 April 1875.

sider that they are hardly quite so good a class as they were.

1549. What is your view of a competitive examination as a method of entering the army, do you think it is a desirable one?—I have no faith in it myself.

1550. Do you think it offers any reasonable guarantee for a man's general fitness as an officer?—I think not.

1551. At the same time, I presume, you are in favour of some examination as a test of the qualifications of a young man?—Yes, certainly. I think that the examination should be more of a professional nature, that is, a young man wishing to enter the army should be examined in points connected with his professional career.

1552. You would insist upon what is called a liberal education?—Yes, at a public school. We never had a better class of officers than those who came from public schools.

1553. You think that the test of having been a certain number of years in a public school would in itself be sufficient for that purpose?—Quite so. I speak from knowledge of them in my own regiment that the best officers that I had were young men who had been at a public school. I am speaking of 20 years and more ago now.

1554. There is a subject which has given rise to some difficulty in the past and may do so still more in the future and that is the supersession of the line officers by the artillery or *vice versâ*. The organization of the line and the artillery being different seems likely at all times to lead to supersessions of one branch by the other?—Yes, I believe so.

1555. Can you help the Commission to any remedy to that?—I have not given the subject such attention as to supply an adequate remedy.

1556. You have formed no definite opinion upon it?—No, I have not.

1557. Do you think the number of officers in a regiment as at present constituted are more than enough for the work or less than enough?—I do not think there are more than enough. I think that every company ought to have three officers.

1558. In India would you make any difference?—In India I think there might be more.

1559. But never less than three?—No.

1560. (*Lord Hampton.*) With a troop also?—Yes, with a troop the same.

1561. (*Chairman.*) Do you approve of the system of young men attending at the Staff College?—Yes.

1562. Do you think that any great benefit is obtained by it?—It is in the cases of some officers, not in all cases, because I do not think the very best officers go to the Staff College, by which I mean that I do not believe that the very best regimental officers go to the Staff College.

1563. You mean that as a rule practically the best officers do not go?—Just so.

1564. Could you give any reason for that?—Perhaps they do not like the study which they may have to go through and the necessary confinement on a course of study. They do not like leaving their regiments. They are fond of their regiments and do not like leaving it for two years. I think that in many instances married officers go to the Staff College with a view to spending two years in comparative quietness and to avoid knocking about with their regiments.

1565. You think that many men that go to the Staff College have collateral motives?—I think so. I do not like to say that that is the case with all, for very many officers who have gone through the Staff College are in all respects perfect regimental officers, but I do not think that every man who goes through the Staff College is so.

1566. You think that going through the Staff College offers certain inducements of a collateral character which men act upon?—Yes, I think it offers a strong inducement to men to avoid regimental duty and to be in one place instead of being moved about, as they would have to do in a marching regiment.

1567. Would you under those circumstances think it desirable to increase the staff of the Staff College and increase the amount of possible education given there?—No, I think it is quite sufficient for the purpose at present.

1568. (*Lord Hampton.*) In recommending the division of the general officers' list into two lists of retired and active officers, would you propose to place any limit on the number?—No, I would leave that to the authorities.

1569. I understood you to express a clear opinion that if the senior captain of a regiment is decidedly inferior to the second captain you would pass him over and promote the second captain?—I would.

1570. Rather than bring in an officer from another regiment?—I would.

1571. That answer rather assumes that you would not pass over a senior captain unless his reputation was such that it was not desirable for him to be promoted to the rank of major?—Yes.

1572. Did I understand you to express an opinion that the rule of five years for a field officer was so objectionable that you would do away with it in all cases excepting were there was an objection to a lieutenant-colonel being retained in his command?—No, I would leave the five years' system as it is. I would leave it at the discretion of the general commanding-in-chief, either to re-appoint a man or to remove him. I do not object to having a system of five years.

1573. (*Chairman.*) Only that you would re-appoint him?—Yes, if he was fit.

1574. (*Lord Hampton.*) As I understood you, you do not object to that rule being maintained as a rule, but as a rule to be applied only in those cases where it was not desirable that an officer should remain in command of his regiment?—Quite so.

1575. In all cases where the officer himself is an officer of such merit that he is a benefit to the public service in his command of a regiment you would retain him?—Yes, I would retain him; otherwise you would treat the good and indifferent officer alike.

1576. You do not think that that might operate hardly upon those who are below that officer and who are looking to succeed him?—It would bear hardly upon the lieutenant-colonel himself, and I think it might be injurious to the regiment and to the service.

1577. You think it would be hard upon him to be deprived of his command, and I think you also expressed an opinion that if that rule was strictly applied it would deprive us of some of our best officers; do not you think there is reason to suppose that those who would come up might be as good as those who go away?—It is quite possible, but the one man has proved himself and the others have not.

1578. But do not you think that the advantage which would necessarily be gained by the increased flow of promotion by the application of the five years' rule would be sufficient to counterbalance the objections to which you have alluded?—No, I think not.

1579. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You object to the re-appointment of staff officers; do I understand you to mean that you would object to the advancement from one grade to a higher as being disadvantageous to the service, the officer thus bringing a large amount of experience with him when called to the higher situation, surely there would be no objection to his re-appointment?—I do not object to the advancement of a staff officer, when practicable, to a higher grade.

1580. In suggesting that an officer who had reached the rank of major-general without having commanded a regiment should be placed upon the retired list, do I understand you to include officers who have held equivalent appointments on the staff, would you retire them?—No, I did not say that. I intended to include officers holding relative positions, by which I mean staff or equivalent appointments.

1581. We have heard several suggestions about the improvement of the education of the army rather tending to the supposition that our officers are under educated, have you read Kinglake's last volume on the Crimean War?—Yes, I have.

Maj.-Gen. Armstrong.

19 April 1875.

1582. In that volume there is this passage with regard to the good service performed on an emergency at the beginning of the battle of Inkerman by several officers; it says at page 173 "It seems hardly "unsafe to conjecture that a number of leaders thus "raised into sudden power by the chances of battle, "after proving every one of them equal to the vary- "ing and successive occasions, were after all only fair "samples of the body from which they came, and that "as regards both those officers and the soldiery under "them, our army at Inkerman was rich in men able "to cope with that kind of emergency which can best "be met by sheer fighting." Do you recognise any truth in that?—I do decidedly.

1583. You would be sorry then to see any great interference with a regimental system which has produced that state of things?—Yes, I should deeply regret it.

1584. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) How long were you in command of a regiment?—I had the command of a regiment and a depôt battalion, which was equivalent to a regiment, six years.

1585. Was it a regiment of infantry?—Yes.

1586. I suppose that was before the system of confidential reports was instituted?—Before the present system, I mean the system of individual reports on officers.

1587. Still, I suppose, as commanding officer, you were well acquainted with the capacity and turn of mind of the different officers in your regiment?—Yes, perfectly.

1588. Would you have had any difficulty if you had been called upon to make a confidential report as to any of your officers being well qualified for staff appointment, or to have procured a man in your regiment whom you would have thought so qualified?—I should have had no difficulty whatever.

1589. You think that you would have had a fair opportunity of doing it and could have done it if you had been called upon?—Yes, I should have had no difficulty whatever.

1590. Can you see any difficulty in the way of a staff officer being selected in that way by the commanding officer of a regiment, that is to say, that it should not be a mere volunteer going to the Staff College?—I see no difficulty whatever.

1591. (*Chairman.*) At present the system with regard to the lower staff appointments is generally to give them, as the commander-in-chief told us, to those who passed the Staff College; do you think that that is a better system than allowing the colonel of a regiment to select those men?—The colonel of a regiment selects, or rather recommends the officers to the Staff College course.

1592. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I meant to suggest that instead of the present system of volunteers going to the Staff College the staff should be definitely composed upon the recommendation of the commanding officers of those gentleman under their command whom they thought most qualified for first-class staff officers; would that answer do you think?—I think not.

1593. Where would be the objection to it?—I think that the officers for the staff, provided that you could get the best men to go, should have a certain amount of special education at the Staff College.

1594. My suggestion is that there should be selection for that education by the commanding officers of regiments?—That is what I understood you originally, and I would approve of that, because at present the candidates for the Staff College are more or less self elected, and unless there is some very strong objection to a candidate, he is generally accepted.

1595. I daresay you can recollect that very often there are gems left in a regiment who would have been admirable staff officers, but who never had an opportunity of getting on to the staff, because they did not offer themselves to go through the educational course?—Just so.

1596. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Do you consider that if the questions which are laid down in the general orders and the Queen's regulations are honestly and conscientiously answered, an officer who is unfit to be a staff officer is at all likely to be allowed to compete for admission to the Staff College?—I do not think an unfit officer could go, provided the answers are given in their full integrity.

1597. You have stated that you consider that promotion should be regimental; do you mean by a regiment the two linked battalions. As you are aware, at present, officers in the line that serve in a particular battalion are interchanged without regard to the particular battalion to which they have been appointed?—I would leave the promotion as it is now in the double-battalion regiment but not in the linked battalion regiment; I object to that system entirely.

1598. Do you consider it possible that officers can be interchanged if promotion does not go in the linked battalions?—I think not.

1599. In a linked battalion the system must fall to the ground?—In that respect it must.

1600. Do not you consider, that having those linked battalions as a unit, would make promotion more equal. Would not a double-battalion regiment be a better unit for promotion according to the numbers?—I do not think so; it might or it might not make promotion more rapid or more equal, but I decidedly object to the system.

1601. Do you consider that local rank in India, by which a captain who had served for 31 years becomes a local full colonel and thereby may take command of the station of his own commanding officer, is an objectionable arrangement?—Yes, I do.

1602. Do you think that the time rank given to the staff corps in India is compatible with any scale of promotion which is likely to take place in the English army?—No, I think not.

1603. Would not a number of appointments, such as brigade commands in India as well as brigade depôts at home and employment on the staff, be available for officers who have served very efficiently in command of regiments, and might not their services thus be retained without re-appointing them as you proposed?—Yes.

1604. If an efficient officer is employed on the staff, should not his services be retained as well as those of the commanding officer? It is acknowledged, I believe, that it is hard to find a well-qualified staff officer or a well-qualified colonel of a regiment?—I think that an officer might be promoted on the staff to a higher rank.

1605. You said you would retain a commanding officer above five years but send a staff officer away; why do you consider that a staff officer should not be retained whilst the commanding officer should?—Because the object of removing him at the end of five years is that you introduce a larger number of officers to the staff.

1606. (*Chairman.*) And so disseminate the knowledge which is to be acquired on the staff?—Yes.

1607. (*Mr. Welby.*) You are aware that one of the questions put to the Commission is that they are to suggest a means whereby the same rapidity of promotion may be procured in future as obtained under the purchase system. If I followed you rightly you were in favour, by way of accelerating promotion in future of an increase in the number of general officers, and you also are in favour of giving liberal pensions at the retirement of officers in the lower grades of the service, but you were not in favour of making retirement compulsory, or of absolutely adhering to the five years' rule?—Just so.

1608. May I ask do you think that the questions put to the Commission would be met by the two suggestions, the increase of the number of general officers and a liberal pension to the lower officers, and that that would absolutely create a sufficient flow of promotion?—I could not say; looking to the future it is a mere matter of opinion, it might or it might not.

1609. (*Chairman.*) You have not looked at it in that light?—No.

1610. You have looked at it rather as generally what you think ought to obtain?—Yes.

Maj.-Gen. Armstrong.

19 April 1875.

1611. (*Mr. Welby.*) Supposing a system of pensions such as you have suggested were carried out, and it were found to be a very high sum that it would amount to, does it occur to you that any other methods of inducing officers to retire, any classes of appointments which might be thrown open to officers willing to retire, would make up for the heavy charges of pensions?—No, I do not know of any other appointments.

1612. (*Chairman.*) Have you thought of appointments under the control department or any other civil offices that might be thrown open to officers as an inducement to retire?—Perhaps in the rank to which I referred, that is captains of a certain number of years' service. I do not know that it would be an inducement, because they would have arrived at a time of life when they would not like to begin a fresh professional career as it might be.

1613. (*Mr. Welby.*) Therefore as an inducement to retire we must look entirely to the money offer that we can make them?—That is the only way that I can see.

1614. (*Chairman.*) Such inducements might be offered with effect, might they not, to a subaltern?—They might in the younger ranks.

1615. Then they would tend to relieve the lower ranks of the army?—Yes, in the younger ranks I think perhaps it might be advisable and you might obtain a plan of promotion by that means, but I think on a man arriving at 40 or 45 years of age it is too late in life for him to begin a new career.

1616. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) You stated that you did not approve of the five years' rule being enforced upon officers commanding regiments; probably you are aware that the commander of a regiment only averaged about six years under the purchase system, therefore the average period would be very little different?—I was not aware of that.

1617. In your opinion is it a good system leaving a colonel in command of his regiment until he is promoted to the rank of major-general?—Not for too long a period.

1618. (*Chairman.*) What are the evils of leaving him in command of his regiment?—The evil of leaving a man in command of his regiment for too long a time is that as he arrived nearer to the rank of general, in the course of human nature, he would not show the same energy after having commanded a regiment for 20 years that he would in the earlier years of his service as a colonel.

1619. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Is there not another evil, that of stopping the promotion of all the officers in the regiment?—Yes, that is an evil.

1620. It appears to be very clear that if this five years' rule is not adhered to a colonel might remain in command until the major who succeeds him would probably almost be too old for the command; that of course is a difficulty?—Yes, that is a difficulty which might arise.

1621. If the five years' rule was enforced, whenever an officer was considered to be very efficient the commander-in-chief could always employ him either on the staff or by giving him a brigade?—Certainly.

1622. Therefore an efficient officer, even if the five years' rule were in force, need never be left idle?—Quite so. I agree that General Herbert's questions which he asked me would make that plain, namely, that officers who were well qualified as commanding officers of regiments might be employed either in the command of brigade depôts or of a brigade either at home or elsewhere, and thus their services would be retained to the country.

1623. And if it was carried out it would meet with the approval of all those who were interested?—Yes.

1624. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Are you aware now that the so-called standard periods for promotion that are likely to be established in the British Army up to the rank of colonel are rather more favourable than the staff corps period?—I do not know that it is so.

1625. (*Chairman.*) It has been suggested, as a modification perhaps of the brevet system, that we might reward distinguished service either by a good-service pension or pay or by a decoration of some sort; what is your opinion of that?—I think that a reward in the shape of distinguished service or good-service pension might be used instead of brevet.

1626. What is your opinion about decoration; are you in favour of decoration?—I think we have enough of them.

1627. Are you in favour of a system which seems to have obtained of late years of giving reward by way of brevet to almost every officer who has been engaged in active operations, and who was named in dispatches?—I think that that has been carried to far too great an excess.

1628. You would reserve it for some more specially distinguished conduct, would you?—Certainly.

1629. And you would not spread it too widely?—I would not.

1630. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) As in the artillery and engineers, the number of field officers is in the proportion of one to three, whereas the proportion is one to six in the line; will not the line officers be continually superseded by the artillery and engineer officers?—Most likely.

1631. Is it not therefore desirable to increase the number of field officers in the line, or what remedy would you propose?—The only remedy which I can see is to reduce the number in the other two corps.

1632. (*Chairman.*) Would you recommend that with reference to the efficiency of the service?—I do not say that.

1633. Are you in favour of increasing the number in the line with reference to the efficiency of the service?—No, I am not. I think that they ought to be equalised.

1634. But if equalised, do you think that the least objectionable way would be to reduce the number in the artillery; is that your view?—Yes, I think so.

1635. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you think that the command of a battery of horse artillery is equally important to the command of a company?—I think that the command of a battery of artillery is of much greater importance.

1636. The one you know is under the command of a major, and the other is under the command of a captain?—Yes.

1637. There is something like consistency in that, is there not?—Yes, there is.

1638. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) But if the company were made a more important unit, would not it then be possible to give the command to a major?—If a company were made a more important unit, then a field officer might be appointed to the command. You speak, I presume, of a double company.

1639. (*Chairman.*) Would you approve of that change in the army organization?—I am not prepared to answer that question; it is an open question and an important one.

1640. And one about which there is a great deal of difference of opinion?—Yes.

1641. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) I believe it is the custom in the army for the general commanding the force after an action to mention in his dispatches every officer who commands a regiment, or battery, or troop, and every officer who holds a staff appointment is mentioned?—Yes.

1642. And to be left out would be a disgrace?—Yes.

1643. Everybody is mentioned?—Yes, as a rule.

1644. If brevet promotion is to continue these majors of artillery, and equally the first captains, would probably get brevet promotion after an action and be made at once lieutenant-colonels?—That would follow; and in this respect the artillery and engineers derive great advantage.

1645. And therefore they would supersede all majors of the line?—Necessarily.

1646. And in consequence either the majors of the line must be superseded by those majors of the horse artillery and foot artillery, or the majors of the

line must have a step of rank to bring them up to an equality ?—Yes.

1647. (*Chairman.*) You stated that you had some objection to a man going straight from the command of a regiment to be major-general, but I do not know whether I am right in understanding your objection to that to consist in a man remaining too long in command of a regiment ?—I mean a man remaining too long in command of a regiment.

Maj.-Gen. Armstrong.
19 April 1875.

1648. If the number of the establishment of generals were increased, so as to make it possible for a man to move without passing through the intermediate period of half-pay straight to the command of a regiment, it would be an improvement, would it not ?—I think it would.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Thursday, 22nd April 1875.

PRESENT :

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Lieutenant-Colonel WILLIAM H. GOODENOUGH, R.A. examined.

Lieut.-Col. Goodenough R.A.
22 April 1875.

1649. (*Chairman.*) I believe you for some years held the post of military attaché to the Embassy in Austria ?—Yes, for about three years.

1650. When did it terminate ?—A year ago.

1651. During the time that you resided in Austria, did you come much in contact with the body of officers of the army there ?—Yes, a great deal.

1652. Did you become familiar with the general organization of the army ?—Yes, certainly.

1653. And with the method of promotion and retirement ?—With the method of promotion certainly, but I never very specially studied the question of retirement; and, moreover, I might add that the pension rules have been altered; new pension rules have been introduced of late. Whether they have passed into law or not I do not know, but the proposition for them emanated from the Government, and that I have read.

1654. With regard to the organization of the army, will you be good enough to give the Commission some general idea of it; beginning from the lowest unit of the infantry regiment, what is the unit there ?—The unit is the company; the companies are grouped in battalions, and the battalions are grouped in regiments. They have 80 infantry regiments of three service battalions, and two reserve battalions each.

1655. To begin a little lower down, what number of men constitute a company ?—To begin at the bottom of the service in the country it generally begins at the age of 20 and is for 12 years, that is to say, three with the colours, seven with the reserve, and two with the Landwehr.

1656. As the inquiry of the Commission is confined to the organization of the army as it relates to the officers, will you be so good as to state the number of men in a company ?—The number of men in a company is 215, or thereabouts, on the war strength, and about 70 on the peace strength.

1657. Is that including officers ?—No, merely privates. There are 91 non-commissioned officers and soldiers together on the peace strength, and 231 on war strength.

1658. How many officers are there to a company ?—A captain and two subalterns, that is to say, an upper lieutenant, a lieutenant, and an officer's representative, who is a cadet.

1659. That makes four on the whole, a captain, a first lieutenant, a second lieutenant, and a third subaltern ?—Yes, who is not an officer. You may call it a probational rank; he is an officer's representative doing officer's duty.

1660. The strength of the company being 93 on the peace establishment, what number of companies go to a battalion ?—Four.

1661. And what are the officers of the battalion ?—A field officer to each battalion, and an adjutant.

1662. That field officer would correspond to our major in the army, I presume ?—Except that he has got a distinct command of a battalion and our major has none.

1663. Passing from the battalion to the regiment,—how many battalions are there to a regiment ?—Three; but that is rather a complicated question. You may say there are three service battalions with the regiment under the colonel. There are two reserve battalions to a regiment on the army list, but which remain at the place from which the men are drawn, whereas the three service battalions (Austria having no colonies as we have), forming the service part of the regiment, move about the country to the different garrisons according as may be desirable, and for those three service battalions there is, besides the battalion field officer, a lieutenant-colonel and a colonel, an adjutant and a quartermaster.

1664. Do you mean a lieutenant-colonel and a colonel for the whole three ?—Yes, for the three battalions.

1665. Then there are three officers commanding battalions, and there are the colonel and the lieutenant-colonel ?—Yes, for the regiment.

1666. What are the functions of a lieutenant-colonel, has he the command of the regiment ?—No, he has not, he is second in command; and sometimes commands a battalion.

1667. Having done with the regiment, the next portion of the organization, I suppose, would be the brigade ?—Yes.

1668. What number of regiments are brigaded together ?—Two regiments form a brigade.

1669. What is the rank and position of the officer who commands the brigade ?—He is a major-general.

1670. There is no other officer, I presume, attached to the brigade as such, except the major-general ?—There is a staff officer.

1671. What is the designation of the staff officer ?—I think he is a brigade staff officer. He is an officer who has passed what is equivalent to the Staff College, and he is reckoned on the staff of the army. He is to all intents and purposes a staff officer distinctly, and not a regimental officer.

1672. Passing from the brigade we come, do we not, to the division ?—Yes. The next is the division.

1673. What is the rank of the officer commanding the division ?—What is called in Austria a lieutenant field marshal, which is equivalent to a lieutenant-general here; about an intermediate rank between a major-general and a general. In the Austrian service

Lieut.-Col. Goodenough, R.A.

22 April 1875.

the major-general is the lowest. There are three grades, the major general, the lieutenant-general, and the general.

1674. Above the division there is the *corps d'armée* ?—Yes, above that there is the *corps d'armée*, which has no existence except in time of war, and excepting in mobilisation in Austria, whereas the division has an every-day existence in time of peace.

1675. To go back again to the bottom of the organization, on what principle are the captains of companies promoted to their position? Is it done by seniority in the regiment or by selection?—As a general rule, by seniority, coupled with qualification.

1676. Does that mean seniority in the regiment?—In each arm of the service in the cavalry, infantry, and artillery, and in some other branches, there is a general list for each arm, and all the officers are borne upon the general list up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

1677. Do they get promotion according to their seniority on that general list?—Yes, subject to the modifications which I could give you if you require them.

1678. You say that seniority is a seniority according to their place upon the entire list for each arm of the service as a rule. To what extent is that rule broken in upon by exceptions?—In the first place there has to be made out annually or twice a year, I do not quite recollect which, what is called a qualification return for each officer, which is intended to point out very clearly what his qualifications are for advancement to the next higher rank, and if he does not fulfil those qualifications he would not be promoted at all. So far for the seniority. In the next place there is in addition to the system of seniority another system which works in with it as well; but the rules which exist and have existed since the year 1871 for that system of promotion, which is promotion out of seniority, have been suspended, or their action has been partially suspended, pending an entire revision of those rules of promotion.

1679. Those rules, I presume, have not been thought entirely satisfactory?—Those rules were not satisfactory, and they are suspended and only in partial operation now, that is to say, they are in operation for those who, having qualified under those rules, are on the senior half of the general list.

1680. Let us first understand about the qualifications which you have described, which regulate the application or not of the rule of seniority. How are those qualifications ascertained and determined?—They are ascertained in the first instance by a committee of the officers of the regiment in the regiment itself.

1681. Does that committee sit every year or at definite periods?—Every time that the return is filled up.

1682. Is that once a year?—Yes, it is once a year.

1683. At stated periods there is a committee of the regiment?—Yes. At periods of at least once a year there is a committee in the regiment, consisting of officers, who must be of a rank above that of the officer to be reported upon. But they are not merely the senior officers of the regiment; the qualification is that they are to be senior to the officer to be reported upon.

1684. But are they officers of the regiment?—Yes, officers of the regiment acquainted with the officer.

1685. Do they report minutely upon the qualifications of the officer?—Minutely. A form is made out, so as to be filled up for 10 years, in order to save time and to facilitate the record. It is made out with columns for 10 years, which are filled up each year in succession. When an officer has served 10 years it is put aside, and another one is begun. There are different heads under which the officer is to be reported upon; and the instructions are that they should be reported upon very minutely, and I believe those instructions are practically carried out.

1686. Do they include all the qualifications that go to make a good officer?—Yes, and also their social bearing and conduct.

1687. When those qualifications have been so ascertained, in what way are they acted upon? Are they acted upon only by way of refusing promotion to a man who is deemed unfit, or are they acted upon comparatively by comparing the different qualifications of different men, and so giving promotion to the best?—No, it is for the purpose not of selection but for the purpose of rejection as regards all the officers, at any rate up to the rank of colonel. My remarks as to seniority apply to officers in the comparatively lower ranks; they do not apply to officers from colonel to general upwards.

1688. Up to and including majors?—Up to and including promotion of Lieutenant-colonels to colonels. They are upon the general list, and are promoted by seniority as a rule, but from colonel to general seniority no longer holds good.

1689. You say that the general list, according to their place in which the seniority and promotion of officers depends, goes up to and includes the rank of lieutenant-colonel, but you say that the general list does not include colonels?—They would go by the comparative dates of their commissions.

1690. That is what we should call their army rank?—Yes, their army rank.

1691. And their seniority would be by the length of time that they had borne their colonel's commission?—Yes; certainly.

1692. Therefore their seniority would be a seniority contrasted with every branch of the service; it would not be merely one branch?—Precisely so.

1693. Up to major you have described that they are on a list which is confined to particular men?—Yes, up to lieutenant-colonels inclusive.

1694. And their seniority runs in the branch?—Yes, it runs in the branch.

1695. As I understand you, those qualifications, being ascertained in the way you have described, are used for the purpose of rejecting men who are not thought worthy of promotion?—Yes.

1696. And then they are passed over?—Yes; they would be passed over. At the same time it is laid down by regulation that an officer has a right to demand through the proper channel to see his qualification return, and it is the duty of the superior if the disqualification is one which it is within the officer's own power to correct, to give him a certified copy of the remarks against him with a view to his correcting it.

1697. If a man is passed over does he generally retire from the army, is it expected that he should do so?—No, in practice he frequently would, but there is no definite rule as to that.

1698. Practically he generally does, does he not?—I could not say. He probably would ultimately, but I think, considering the nature of the service and the manner in which it is formed, there are many men who would not consider it perhaps a very great stigma if they were passed over for certain things. It would depend upon the nature of the case, because many officers in the Austrian army are men of very humble origin.

1699. Coming to the grade of colonel you say they are appointed generally by seniority according to their seniority in the army?—Yes.

1700. With regard to them are any qualification reports made?—Just the same.

1701. The same rule obtains?—Yes; I might say that in addition to the reporting by the committee this qualification return passes through all the superiors in a regular channel through the military hierarchy, and each officer has to give his *visa*, that is to say, his approval or otherwise is marked upon the return.

1702. Is there any restriction to the period of time during which a man may hold the commission of major or lieutenant-colonel or colonel?—No, I do not think there is any restriction of that sort.

1703. Is there any period of compulsory retirement in the Austrian army?—There is no prescribed time.

1704. They go on, do they, until they get a very old age?—Yes, until they get a comparatively old age. Every officer is entitled after 40 years' service to full pay retirement, so that he has nothing more to gain, and he goes naturally at the end of 40 years. At the end of 40 years' service he is entitled to full pay retirement without any consideration of his state of health at the time, and without having to prove any physical disability, whereas before 40 years he must prove his physical disability to enable him to be qualified for a pension.

1705. Is that a reality or a mere form?—I think it is leniently dealt with. The regulation appears in writing to be more strict than it is as carried out, because I have seen several men who appeared to be pretty hale and hearty who were pensioned; but it is always difficult to get an opinion upon that, because men are not fond of telling one the ailments which they suffer from, and they may suffer from things of which you do not hear of but which nevertheless they are able to prove satisfactorily before a board. I think, however, that they are not over strict.

1706. It would be known in the army that it would be an easy thing to get a certificate that would satisfy the authorities?—They are not so strict in practice. When an officer has served a considerable number of years, say 25 years or 30 years, if he can prove any reasonable case of disability he is allowed to retire upon the pension which his length of service entitles him to, which is on a regular scale.

1707. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Is it in all ranks that the retirement is after 40 years' service?—Yes, that applies to every rank. The pension is based upon the pay which an officer is in receipt of at the time of his retirement, and he gets a certain proportion according to the number of years' service.

1708. (*Chairman.*) A certain proportion of his full pay; that proportion bearing relation to the number of years that he has served?—Yes; that is to say, after 10 years' service there is a difference almost for every year. This was the proposition of the Government. I do not know whether it has been passed into law or not that after 10 years one third of the full pay was to be allowed to officers who were physically disqualified. Between 10 and 15 it appears to remain the same, but after 15 years there is an increase, and after that there is a difference of every year up to 40.

1709. Can you give the Commission a general idea what number of years' service on the average a man would remain in the rank of a captain; or, in other words, after how many years' he would become a major on the average?—I could give that. I should like to say that the state of the ages and the length of service in the different ranks of officers in the Austrian army can hardly be said yet to have settled down to the normal state of what it will be, because they have not yet outlived the effects of the old system of promotion by patronage which prevailed up to or shortly before 1866, so that the officers who are now generals and colonels are frequently men who benefited by the old system of patronage when an officer commanding a regiment was able sometimes (and there are stories of that sort current) to promote some favourite from a lieutenant to a captain in a single night after dinner. The patronage which was exercised then still exercises its influence over the army, but generally the senior captains on the list three years ago were captains of 1859, and they are so still.

1710. That is to say captains who had become captains in 1859?—Yes.

1711. That was the case three years ago; therefore in 1872 a senior captain would have had 12 or 13 years' service as a captain in that rank?—Yes, but I could ascertain that more correctly.

1712. As I understand you, that information would be less important, because some officers of the existing army came in under a system of promotion by way of patronage, which is non-existent?—I should say that the exercise of patronage was the exception, not the rule. You will find that the bulk of the senior captains were of about the same standing.

1713. Those would be the senior captains with 13 years' service in the rank—below that of course the evil would be very slight, but what would be the average service of a captain, that is to say, upon the average how long under the Austrian system does it take a man to become a major?—I should say 20 or more years for the infantry and 15 years for the cavalry.

Lieut. Col Goodenough, R.A

22 April 1875.

1714. Having attained the rank of field officer, how long would it be before, on the average, he would get command of a regiment?—I should say 10 years to 15 years.

1715. How early do the officers enter the army in Austria?—At from 17 to 25 years of age. You rarely find that anyone would come in so late as 25, practically they enter at 20.

1716. 30 years' service would give you the age of 49 before a man got the command of a regiment; does that accord pretty well with your recollection?—Yes, that would be about the age; it would be nearly up to that in the infantry, but of course somewhat less in the cavalry. The object of my mentioning patronage is to call attention to the fact that owing to that old system you find numerous exceptions, and that you very frequently find a man who is a great deal younger than his fellows in the same rank who has been advanced rapidly in the earlier stages under the old system.

1717. How are the major-generals commanding brigades appointed; is there any system of seniority that determines those commands?—They are selected from the senior colonels, but by the regulation it is ordered that seniority is not to be the rule for their selection, but practically the seniors are generally promoted.

1718. But there is a distinct regulation that they are not to expect to be promoted on account of their seniority?—Precisely so.

1719. And with regard to the command of a division, is that dealt with in the same way?—Yes, in the same way, but it was my experience in watching the promotions that the seniors were generally taken with few exceptions.

1720. Is there any system of half pay in the Austrian army?—Not to any extent; it is partially allowed to a small number of officers temporarily but it is hardly worth while to mention.

1721. That temporary half-pay is applicable perhaps to men who are disqualified from active service?—Yes, to those who are temporarily disqualified.

1722. There is no system of half-pay equivalent to what we have in the British army?—No, not equivalent to what we have in the British army, but everybody who retains the rank of officer on retiring, and who is fit for service, is put down on a list, and is called upon to serve in time of need. The government retains its hold and its claim upon the services of everybody if he retains the rank of officer on leaving the service, provided that he is physically qualified.

1723. When you get to the higher grade of major-generals, lieutenant-generals, and generals, is there any system by which those who become too old for active service are separated from those who are still capable of command, do they form a different class in any form?—They would be retired.

1724. But they would retain their names on one general list, there would be no separation into a separate class of those who are what you may call non-effective?—No; they retain their names upon the general list, but they appear in the army list as employed generals and unemployed generals.

1725. Do they form two different lists, or is it only writing "Employed" opposite a man's name?—They form two separate lists in the Army List.

1726. If a man is one day on the list of unemployed generals, may he be the next day an employed general?—It means as a rule that they are on pension, and that they will not be employed again. Instances have happened, and may happen, of officers being employed again; but as a rule when you see his name

Lieut. Col. Goodenough, R.A.

22 April 1875.

in the Gazette as having accepted a pension he retires to a state of inactivity, and although the Emperor could call upon him if he chose to serve again, as a rule he remains where he is.

1727. Therefore he passes on to a sort of retired list?—Yes, he passes on to a retired list.

1728. Are there any special modes of remunerating the generals of higher rank or do they acquire a salary according to their rank?—They have a salary according to their rank, and a certain command pay.

1729. With regard to any requirements in the direction of education, are there any examinations to be passed upon entering the army?—Yes.

1730. Is that a competitive examination or is it a test or qualifying examination?—It is a qualifying examination.

1731. If a young man passes it, is he sure of his commission?—Yes; that is to say, competition to enter the army has never been so strong that they get more candidates than there are vacancies, but rather the other way.

1732. Have they a difficulty in getting the officers that they want?—Yes, they have a difficulty in getting officers of the description that they want.

1733. Is that a recent difficulty, or has it always been so in Austria, so far as you can learn?—No, it has been much more the case recently than it had been before. The whole question is intimately connected with the question of the prosperity of the country; whereas formerly things were very dead, about three or four years ago there was a general galvanism into active life when the railways were being constructed all over the country, and it was especially at that time that it was much more difficult to get young men to come forward to be officers. I daresay just now it may be probably a little less difficult.

1734. After once they have entered the army are they again subject to examination in order to rise to the higher ranks?—They are subject to examination from captain to major.

1735. Is there any examination after that?—None after that.

1736. I presume that the examination from captain to major is like the former, a qualifying or test examination?—Yes, it is a qualifying examination.

1737. Is there any institution at all similar to our Staff College?—Yes, there is the War School.

1738. Is the attendance on that school voluntary or compulsory?—Voluntary.

1739. What advantages does a man secure to himself by having passed through the War School?—He secures the advantage, if a lieutenant, of obtaining a title to his promotion out of turn without seniority, of which I spoke a little while ago; and he also obtains a title to employment on the staff.

1740. Is it a matter of course that if he gets a certificate of a certain character, he shall be promoted out of his turn?—Yes, as a lieutenant on passing through the War School and obtaining a certificate of excellence. The certificates are given in four grades, "excellent," "very good," "good," and "not qualified." If he gets "excellent" as a lieutenant he is immediately promoted to a first lieutenant on coming out of the school.

1741. That is the way in which it is worked out, namely, that if he gets a high certificate he gets promotion?—Yes, if he gets "excellent" he obtains promotion in the line immediately from lieutenant to first lieutenant. If he gets "very good," he obtains the right to promotion out of turn according to what is called the first category; but that is the principle that I spoke of as being in abeyance at present.

1742. After reaching the rank of major, you have done with examinations, I suppose?—Yes, after reaching the rank of major that is so, except that there was a system of examining officers for promotion according to the second category, under that code of promotion the regulations of which I speak of as being at the present time in abeyance, under which majors and lieutenant-colonels were eligible to go up for an examination if they chose, and on passing which they became entitled to promotion at a more rapid rate than other officers.

1743. Will you be good enough to give the Commission a little further information upon that point; what are the means by which a flow of promotion is attained in the army; is there nothing but death to create vacancies?—Death, and the retirements which occur from length of service or from being invalided.

1744. Are the retirements from being invalided very numerous?—Yes, they are numerous, but the promotion is very slow. I think that the figures which I gave of the ages rather tend to point to that. I may state that I accompanied once a class of 40 infantry captains who were going through a course previous to passing their examination for major, and I had an opportunity of seeing what those senior captains were. They were some of them decidedly old, in point of fact a great deal too old for captains, men varying from 35 to 50.

1745. The rate of promotion that you have mentioned, namely, 20 years before attaining the rank of major, is not widely different from that which has obtained in our army under the purchase system, under which 18½ years was the average?—It is possible that I may not have given it high enough.

1746. Still the promotion is looked upon as slow in the Austrian army, or are they satisfied with it?—It is not satisfactory.

1747. With reference to the system of promoting men up to and including the rank of lieutenant-colonel according to their seniority on the general list, which embraces the whole arm of the service, does not that system tend very much to break up anything like what we call the regimental system in England?—It does, no doubt, tend that way.

1748. Are there any qualifications which reduce its effect very much?—The circumstance of the men of a regiment coming from a particular quarter of the country, and their generally remaining stationary in one place for a long time, and their being called generally instead of by a number by the name of the person or the formerly so called proprietor of the regiment tends to create a strong regimental *esprit*.

1749. If, when the post of lieutenant becomes vacant, the appointment is immediately filled up from some man outside the regiment, the regiment would be in a constant state of transition, would it not, so far as its *personnel* was concerned?—Yes.

1750. So that the men do not hang together and go through their career in the same regiment?—No, they do not certainly; they move from one regiment to another constantly.

1751. Do they mess together?—No, there is nothing of that kind in the Austrian army. I should say that by the means which I have described the regimental feeling is kept up through a regiment, although there is not the same family regimental feeling through the officers as is the case when the body of officers live and serve together through many years.

1752. To what extent has the average which you have given us of the rate of promotion to which I referred just now, namely, 20 years' service before becoming major, been affected by the late war, which must have killed a great many men in the Austrian army?—The wars made great irregularities in promotion, so that you find, for instance, a great many men at the top of the captain's list, who, I believe, speaking from recollection, got their captaincy in 1859. Although their promotion since they became captains has gone on very slowly, it does not follow that their promotion up to captain was proportionately slow; there was great rapidity in promotion up to that time.

1753. What period have you in your mind when you give 20 years as the period of service after which a man would become major? Are you considering promotion as it has shown itself in the period embracing the late wars, or the period before that, or the two periods together?—I give that as what it is now, or, rather, two years ago. I think that 20 years had better be put down as the average time

to major, because the ages of the senior captains with whom I was associated on the occasion that I spoke of as constituting that class of 40 was certainly rather above 40, I should think that the average age would be at least 40. There were great irregularities. There were one or two instances of men who were nearly 50, and the youngest, I suppose, would be about 35.

1754. (*Major-General Johnson.*) Were they senior captains in the army?—They were senior captains in the infantry, in which there is the slowest promotion. The senior captains of cavalry were a great deal younger. The senior captains of cavalry at the same time were men of about 34 or 35.

1755. (*Chairman.*) To what extent does favouritism or interest do you think prevail under the new system in the Austrian army with regard to giving promotion?—Very little, if at all; I might almost say not at all. Indeed, I think not enough, perhaps.

1756. What do you mean by that answer?—I mean that I think that they went too much to an extreme. I think, in a country where you have a strong aristocratic feeling, and where government by the aristocracy has been the rule for centuries, in all the countries—Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, and so forth—at once to ignore the aristocracy, and to introduce such measures as must disgust them, and prevent them from sending their sons into the service, must be detrimental to the country; and that is what has been done, there cannot be a question about it.

1757. Has it had the effect of driving out the aristocracy?—Yes, no doubt; whereas formerly all houses of family almost sent their sons into the army, now they do not. The requirements for passing before entry into the service are so strict, and the duties are so very laborious, that they do not enter, with rare exceptions.

1758. Is that the case to a marked degree?—Yes, to a very marked degree; and it is well known and talked of.

1759. Is it talked of as a misfortune?—Yes, it is talked of as a misfortune certainly.

1760. The circumstances that have led to that, being the much harder work in the army, and no advantage of any sort being given to them on account of their social position?—Precisely so.

1761. (*Lord Hampton.*) Did I understand you correctly to use the expression "proprietor of a regiment"?—Yes.

1762. Will you be so good as to explain what you mean by the "proprietor of a regiment"?—The "proprietor of a regiment" is the term given to the so-called colonel of the regiment. "Proprietor" is a literal translation of "*Inhaber*" the German word which is used. I alluded to a title which now exists only in name, and which carries no longer any administrative or other power with it. A regiment now is called by the name of its proprietor, but whereas the proprietor used formerly to have the power of recommending officers for promotion, now he has none.

1763. Did it seem that the word "proprietor" in our English sense of the word was appropriate to it to some extent?—Yes, it was to the extent that he had great influence over the promotion in the regiment, the promotion of officers at that time being by regiments, and not by general lists in the army as at present.

1764. And not connected with any existing custom of the officer in that country as has been known in this country raising a regiment itself?—No.

1765. If I understand you rightly, the term is now obsolete and is no longer appropriate in any sense?—The term is not obsolete inasmuch as you find it at the head of every regiment in the army list, but the position is an honorary one as regards duty, whereas formerly it carried with it power.

1766. Are the Commission to understand that there is in each regiment an officer or a person bearing the title of "proprietor" independently of the officer who is colonel of the regiment; is it a distinct person from the colonel?—Yes, it is a distinct person from the colonel. The position is somewhat similar or almost entirely similar to that which is held in our service, where you have the colonel of the regiment and the lieutenant-colonel in executive command. The colonel of a regiment in England is represented in Austria by the "proprietor" of the regiment, who is a general officer.

1767. In point of fact it is analogous to our system of honorary colonelcies?—Yes.

1768. Does the proprietor take any active part in the command of the regiment?—None whatever, the only active part that I ever saw taken was at a review, when the Emperor of Russia was present. A general officer whose regiment was on the ground fell out from the staff and marched past at the head of his regiment, which is much the same as we might see in our own service at any time.

1769. But irrespective of the proprietor there is a colonel and a lieutenant-colonel in each regiment?—Yes, who do the duty.

1770. You used the expression some little time ago that many of the Austrian officers were of humble origin; is that in consequence of the change that you have just been speaking of, that the aristocracy have ceased to enter the army?—No, most distinctly not. It is a fact which is rather lost sight of by a great many people in criticizing the Austrian army, but I am quite sure that it has always been the case from the earliest times, because the number of officers in the army were at all times, and for a great many years, far beyond the number which could be supplied by the aristocracy of the country; but in the absence of the aristocracy, the humble men are comparatively more numerous in proportion than they used to be.

1771. What is the system under which young men get their first commissions in the army?—They pass an examination for cadets, after which they are appointed cadets.

1772. From what sources are those young officers to whom you have alluded as being of more "humble origin" derived?—They are partly raised in each regiment by the schools of the regiment, and they partly come from the Military Academy, which is an old and almost venerable institution, and which is in great repute in the country, but which supplies only a comparatively very small number of officers to the army every year as compared to the total number required. The want of officers is such that every effort is made to attract them from all sources, the principal source being through the regiment itself, where young men who have some education to start with have opportunities offered them of going on improving and qualifying themselves to pass the examination which is requisite for the standing of an officer, and which is very severe.

1773. Since the changes to which you have referred I presume that young men of that class form the largest proportion of the officers of the army?—Yes.

1774. But the aristocracy do enter the army to some extent, do they not?—Yes, to some extent.

1775. Did I understand you rightly to say that a great change in the organization of the army took place after the late war with Prussia?—Yes, there were great changes made.

1776. Are they completed or are they still in progress?—By far the larger part of them are fully completed.

1777. With regard to the organization of the cavalry, I presume that the unit of a cavalry regiment is the squadron, as in other nations?—Yes, and there are six squadrons to the regiment.

1778. How many men are there in each squadron?—150 men to each squadron, and they are always kept up to war strength. It is regarded as a matter of paramount importance that the cavalry should be always at war strength in order that there should be no buying and bringing in of horses for the cavalry at the last moment.

1779. What officers are there to each squadron of 150?—There are a captain, two first lieutenants, two

Lieut.-Col. Goodenough, R.A.

22 April 1875.

lieutenants, and an officer's representative. Six officers altogether.

1780. In point of fact, if I understand you rightly, the same as a company of infantry?—I think I said that a company of infantry had only only four officers altogether.

1781.—When you speak of an officer's representative you mean a cadet?—He is an upper-class of cadet; he is a cadet who has served some time. A cadet is a man learning his work, whereas the officer's representative is a cadet who having learnt his work is not yet promoted to lieutenant.

1782. What field officers are there in a cavalry regiment?—There are a major, a lieutenant-colonel. and a colonel, the colonel commanding the whole regiment and the lieutent-colonel and the major taking each a division or wing of three squadrons, that is to say, one half of the regiment.

1783. Is there a proprietor to each of those regiments?—Yes.

1784. I think you have told us that the generals of the Austrian army are divided into two lists, the actively employed and the unemployed; are the officers of whom you speak as being called proprietors limited to either of those categories?—No, they may be either actively serving or they may not.

1785. Are all the general officers proprietors of their regiments?—No, because there are many more general officers than there are regiments.

1786. Is the system somewhat similar to ours, that officers are selected, as vacancies occur, to be the proprietors of regiments?—Yes.

1787. Does that carry increased pay with it?—I think not, so far as my recollection serves me.

1788. Does it carry any military advantage of any sort, or is it merely an honour?—I do not think it carries any military advantage with it.

1789. (*Mr. Bouverie*). With regard to the system of reporting upon the officers year by year for promotion I think you mentioned that the social habits of an officer form one of the points of the report?—Yes.

1790. Are officers excluded from their want of qualification in a social respect from being promoted? Is that a common thing?—No it is not a common thing by any means because great pains are taken in the first instance not to admit an officer as lieutenant unless socially approved. One of those cadets who are trained in the regiment would not be recommended for promotion to an officer unless he was favorably reported upon socially.

1791. Is there any promotion to an officer's position from the ranks?—No, none at all in time of peace, but in the event of there being a deficiency of officers on mobilisation, a non-commissioned officer would be named during peace who would be ready to take the place first of an officer's representative on mobilisation and then to be advanced to an officer should it be necessary.

1792. Are there officers in the army now who have risen in that way?—Not that I ever heard of, but, as I said before, there are numbers of officers who have risen from the system which I have endeavoured to describe, namely, making every regiment a nursery for officers. In the Austrian service a good many officers of the future, as in the past, are at first privates, but the difference between that system and the system of promotion from the ranks, as generally understood, is that it means that a man enters as a private and then qualifies for an officer, whereas, as generally understood, promotion from the ranks means that he enters as a private and becomes a non-commissioned officer, and is recommended from his merits as a non-commissioned officer to become an officer, which is a very different thing.

1793. In Austria from his first admission to the service he has had a mark upon him hoping to become an officer?—Very frequently. Some would have a mark upon them and some would not, and some would only think of it perhaps after a year or two.

1794. Has a young man on entering the army as a private with that intention an opportunity at the regimental school for qualifying himself for becoming an officer?—Yes, the whole scope of the regulations upon that head is intended to give him every opportunity to do so.

1795. Practically, has that been largely made use of, do you think, in the Austrian army?—It is largely made use of.

1796. What class of men do they get; do they get a class of promising officers?—I have seen some very rough specimens very often, but then the army is very large and "society" is comparatively very small, and I have no doubt that it has always been the same to a considerable extent. In the absence of the upper classes in the army, which is more marked now than formerly, of course those who come from a low origin tend to predominate.

1797. As I understand you, the aristocratic element formerly tended to modify and soften the rougher portion of the officers?—Yes, no doubt it had a great effect in that direction.

1798. And that has been proportionately very much less than formerly?—Yes, proportionately less.

1799. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Is there any fixed establishment of general officers?—There is a fixed establishment of general officers who are actively serving.

1800. How are their numbers regulated?—According to the number of posts that are to be filled.

1801. That is on the active list?—Yes, that is on the active list. I do not think there is any fixed establishment in the sense that we have it.

1802. Then how does an officer get into the grade of major-general—does he reach it, as a matter of course, after a certain number of years service?—No. If one who is actively serving takes his retirement, or if he dies, there would be a step for somebody to be promoted to general. But it is not a subject that I have carefully studied.

1803. (*Chairman.*) What I understand your impression to be is this, that a man becomes a general when there is a vacancy for active employment?—Yes, when there is a vacancy for active employment.

1804. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Can you say how the retired list of generals is formed?—A general on the active list having served say 40 years, or having served 30 years and being ill; say that he is subject to periodical fits of partial blindness, he goes before a board, and he goes on a retirement, proportioned to his full pay and his place has to be filled up; then he would appear in the Army List as a general out of employ.

1805. I did not quite understand from you whether there was any examination to which officers were subjected for promotion to the rank of lieutenant-colonel and colonel?—There is none which has necessarily to be passed for the ordinary seniority promotion, there is none for those ranks; the only examinations are the examinations on entrance when a young man is appointed a cadet, and from captain to major, which are necessary to be passed.

1806. If an officer is passed over for promotion is he permitted to remain an indefinite time in the service?—I think so. I think that it has not been found necessary to make any regulation about that.

1807. Are there many on the average who are passed over for promotion?—Not in the seniority system. There have been a great many who have been passed over on the system that I spoke of, which is now in abeyance. Under the system of promotion out of turn they were passed over wholesale, but there are not many, as far as I know, pronounced disqualified in consequence of the system of qualification returns.

1808. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Before being promoted to the command of a brigade, is it a fact that a colonel has to go through a practical test, which consists of handling in the field a mixed force comprised of three battalions, three squadrons, and half a battery of artillery, in the presence of a board composed of a general officer of high rank, a general of brigade, a

field officer of the general staff, and a field officer of each of the three arms, who are called upon to report upon his efficiency?—That is not the case as regards a colonel for appointment to the command of a brigade; but an examination of that kind is held as a part of the examination for promotion from captain to major, and it is also a part of the examination for the promotion according to the second category, which involves great privileges, and at the ordinary annual manœuvres every superior officer is practically tested by his superiors in the handling of the three arms.

1809. In order to obtain the rank of field officer is a captain obliged to go through an examination in strategy, such as a project of a given operation, criticism on the operations of a campaign, history of the art of war, and in tactics, and also a practical test which consists in handling on the field a small force of the three arms?—Yes, certainly; I have witnessed those examinations.

1810. Does a captain of infantry obtain forage for a horse before he has passed through the promotion examination qualifying him for a higher rank; is he mounted in fact?—A captain of infantry was not mounted when I was in Austria, but I believe he is now. He was mounted if he chose to mount himself. His position as a mounted officer was recognised.

1811. Do you know it as a fact that before an officer has passed his examination for the higher rank he is not allowed to be mounted?—I do not think that that is so, because he is allowed to be mounted as a captain.

1812. But he does not get forage?—No, he does not get forage; no captain gets forage.

1813. Are there not many captains in Austria who do not wish for promotion, but who want to obtain appointments as commandants of garrisons, forts, hospitals, transport houses, and other local appointments?—Yes, I believe so; and that accounts I would add for their being passed over sometimes without making much fuss about it.

1814. Are officers who have failed after three years' residence to acquire the dialect of the part of the country in which they may be quartered, or of the regiment to which they belong, passed over for promotion?—There are regulations upon the subject. It is one of the conditions of the qualification return, I think, in every instance, that an officer should be competent in another language besides the German language; but I do not think that it is considered absolutely necessary that the language which he knows should be the language of the country in which his regiment is quartered.

1815. Or of the regiment to which he belongs?—No, nor of the regiment to which he belongs. I do not think that is considered necessary. I think that the regulation is that he should master one of the languages of the monarchy other than German.

1816. You say that there are four companies in a battalion; how long has this been the division of a battalion?—Since 1866, or shortly after 1866.

1817. Was not that alteration made as a tactical improvement after the experience gained during the war?—Yes.

1818. Am I right in understanding that promotion takes place first by seniority on a general list, and secondly the seniority on a special list, the latter list comprising those officers who have passed a certain higher class examination?—Yes, that is a correct description of the system in other words.

1819. Are officers on long leave or on sick leave in Austria placed on the supernumerary list, and their places filled up?—Yes.

1820. Are not retired officers on two lists, the one retired altogether, and the other liable to be employed at a depôt or in any non-combatant establishment?—I believe that that is correct. I believe that the other list is a list of those who are physically unfit when they retire. If physically unfit they do not serve, but if physically fit they do serve and they are recorded as liable to serve.

1821. Before an officer is appointed to a regiment is it true that the consent of all the officers of the regiment with reference to the social rank of the candidate is necessary?—I would not say of all the officers, but there are some means afforded for the expression of opinion of the officers of that regiment upon his social qualifications.

1822. (*Mr. Welby.*) Do many officers of independent means enter the Austrian army and stay only for a few years?—A very few, or I may almost say none.

1823. Then in point of fact, by that means the flow of promotion is not accelerated?—There is very little acceleration from that source.

1824. Is a private whom you have spoken of as intending to become an officer treated in any way differently from an ordinary private, is there any relaxation of the regulation for him?—Yes. It varies somewhat in different regiments; but facilities would be given to put them together generally by themselves, and they are generally protected and taken care of by the officer commanding the regiment.

1825. Are the retirement terms of the Austrian army looked upon as satisfactory by the army, or is it a question amongst the officers of trying to get them improved?—It is a question of trying to get them improved. For instance, in a proposition which I have lately read, whereas under the present rules they maintain the system of giving full-pay retirement after 40 years, it was thought, and specially with reference to the very hard work which officers have to go through now by the constant changes of men, that that might be a reason for making the length of service shorter, and it appears in the military papers in which I read this that they would have been satisfied with 35 years.

1826. The present retirement rules are a recent introduction are they not?—I said before that the 40 years has been, I believe, in force before, but as to the retirement rules, I am not aware that they have been passed into a law yet. The evidence that I gave about the retirement rules was with regard to the proposition which had been laid before the house, but I think not much modification would be likely to be made in it.

1827. (*Maj.-Gen. Forster.*) Are the general officers in active employ in time of peace sufficient in number for the army in time of war, or is there an increase made of general officers?—They are sufficient by having to every command a second in command who has practically nothing to do in peace, or very little to do.

1828. Do I understand that there are two general officers to a brigade?—No, the command I speak of is a local territorial commander.

1829. The commander of a *corps d'armée* do you mean?—No; there are no *corps d'armée* in peace. The country is divided into territorial divisions and in every one of those territorial divisions there is an extra general, who has practically nothing to do with the command; he only acts as second in command.

1830. There is no increase to the general officers in time of war, or at least not necessarily?—No, only to some very small extent there would be.

1831. (*Chairman.*) With regard to officers of the staff, what qualifications lead to the selection of officers in the first instance for the lower grade on the staff?—An officer having been favourably reported on in the qualification return, he passes through a course of two years, I think it is, in the War School, and after thas he is usually appointed as a staff officer to a brigade.

1832. Do the staff officers form a separate class, or are they regimental officers?—They are regimental officers.

1833. Are they taken on to the staff, and after a period return to the regiment?—Yes, formerly the staff in the Austrian army formed a class by themselves on a list of their own, and that being found objectionable, great alterations were made in the Austrian army when the list was broken up; and the general staff were then attached to the regiments where they are borne as supernumeraries, and after a certain number of years' service on the staff, they are

Lieut.-Col. Goodenough, R.A.

22 April 1875.

obliged to return to their regiment to do duty for a certain number of years before they would be qualified for promotion to the next rank.

1834. When they are removed from the regiment to the staff their place is filled up ?—Yes.

1835. And when they are returned to the regiment they are supernumeraries ?—When they are returned to the regiment, they become active members of the regiment. When they come back it is to serve for two or three years, and they become an integral part of the regiment, and take the place perhaps of some other officer who has been named to the staff.

1836. I presume that the staff appointments are by selection ?—Yes.

1837. That selection being based upon the qualification report, and upon success in passing through the War School ?—Yes.

1838. How long do you say they hold a staff appointment ?—That is not definite, I think. The point that is definite is that an officer must pass a certain time in the regiment with the troops, without which he cannot be advanced to the next rank on the staff. Subject to that condition, I do not think that the actual time of service in any particular staff appointment is fixed. There is not the same occasion for it as there is in some other services, because for one thing, they are not paid extra on the staff.

1839. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Are all staff officers selected from a special list of those who have passed the higher class examinations for promotion ?—No.

1840. Are they taken from the ordinary seniority class ?—I know of nothing to prevent an officer who has passed through the War School who has only been marked "good," being appointed to the staff. I never knew of anything against that; but a preference would be given to those who had passed best out of the War School.

1841. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) With regard to the number of officers per company, which you told us was the establishment of the Austrian army, was that a peace establishment, or a war establishment ?—For cavalry squadrons it is the same in peace and war. In infantry companies an extra subaltern is added for war from the reserve officers or otherwise.

The witness withdrew.

Lieutenant-General Sir J. Lintorn Simmons, R.E., examined.

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lintorn Simmons, R.E.

1841. (*Chairman.*) Do you hold any official position at present ?—Yes, that of Governor of the Royal Military Academy and colonel commandant of Royal Engineers.

1842. The Commission would be glad of your assistance with reference to some of the questions upon which we have been engaged, and first we should be glad of your opinion as to the method of promotion generally; whether it should be a system of promotion by seniority tempered, as has been said, by selection, or whether you are in favour of any other system ?—I think that promotion would be best carried out by seniority tempered by selection to the extent of the Commander-in-Chief having power to pass an officer over, or to give promotion for distinguished service in the field.

1843. Speaking now of the ranks in a regiment below that of field officer, as a rule would you say that the promotion in those various grades should go by seniority ?—Certainly; subject to a power being reserved of passing a man over if he was not found fit.

1844. Would that seniority be regimental seniority or seniority in the army ?—The proposition which I would make would be to make it regimental to a certain extent; that as regards the infantry, it should be divided into districts or army corps, and the promotion should be partly by seniority in the army corps; that with regard to the artillery, the engineers, and the cavalry, which are smaller bodies than the infantry, it might be by seniority in the whole of each of those arms. The way in which I think it might be carried out is this, that promotion should be regimental by seniority, provided the man so promoted did not get more than a certain amount, say two years of advantage, that is to say, that he did not hop over another man's head who was more than two years his senior in that rank.

1845. You mean in that rank in that branch ?—Yes, in that rank in that branch, or in that army corps, as I explained with regard to the infantry; in that case it should go by seniority in the army corps.

1846. You say that you would take a given district and look upon the men holding their different ranks below the rank of major in the different regiments in that district as one body for the purpose of calculating their seniority in that body, and in the particular ranks that they hold in that body ?—Yes.

1847. And then when a vacancy fell in a particular regiment you would follow the regimental seniority and give the vacancy to the next senior officer in the regiment, provided that by so doing you did not pass over any man in the district who was more than two years his senior ?—That is so, except that in the case of a regiment being upon active service, I would then allow all the promotion to be in the regiment provided the man who was to be promoted was with his regiment on service. If he happened to be at home, then I would revert to the other principle of promoting in the army corps.

1848. You would say that promotion should be by seniority, but you would combine the seniority in the district with the seniority in the regiment in the way you have just described ?—Yes; the object being, as I take it, still to keep up the regimental system, but at the same time to prevent an extraordinary flow of promotion in a regiment from accidental causes which might cause dissatisfaction to other regiments.

1849. And to some extent to equalize the flow of promotion in the various regiments in the district ?—Just so, still without altogether breaking up the regimental system.

1850. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) How would you define active service; would you mean active service in the field or active service abroad ?—I mean service in the field before an enemy strictly.

1851. (*Chairman.*) The questions which I have put to you have been confined to the ranks and grades up to and below the rank of major. Would the answers that you have given apply to the rank of field officer as well ?—I should like to modify the answer I am about to give by a little explanation of what I think should be in the army. I think you want a re-constitution of the army in the regimental ranks.

1852. But keeping that question separate, at present we have first to deal with the question of promotion and retirement, as it is to be applied to the existing organization, and will you therefore be so kind as to direct your answers to that point ?—The existing organization is so difficult to comprehend that it is difficult to answer the question with reference to it; but I think that the promotion of colonels should be throughout the whole army, irrespective of the arms of the different branches of the service, and that that of lieutenant-colonels should be by seniority in the different branches of the service upon the general list of those branches, subject to any man being passed over if he was not fit; but as regards majors I think it so desirable that there should be a great change in the army with regard to their number, and duties, that it is difficult to answer the question; but if the present system is continued, I think the best way would be by promotion, either in the special arm, or by seniority on the district list.

1853. As regards the majors, you would, under the existing organization, let the promotion go by seniority

in the district list ?—Yes, or else in the special arm of the service, for instance in the artillery, engineers, or cavalry.

1854. Or else a list composed of the entire body of men in that arm of the service ?—Quite so ; I propose a district list for the infantry, because the number of officers in the infantry is so very large. The district list would not be applicable to the artillery, the engineers, or the cavalry.

1855. The lieutenant-colonel, in your opinion, ought also to go by seniority, but there the seniority would be in the entire arm, as I understand you ?—In the entire branch of the service ; so that a lieutenant-colonel of engineers, or a lieutenant-colonel of artillery, or a lieutenant-colonel of cavalry, would be promoted in his own arm; but after that, general officers being all irrespective of arms, I do not see why it should not follow the general army list.

1856. In all those different grades you have introduced the exception "provided that a man is fit and competent ;" with regard to that competency, what is your opinion of the present system of regimental reports ?—The present system of confidential reports gives a certain indication of a man's competency or incompetency ; but the reports on officers vary so very much, according to the character or capacity of the inspecting officer, that I do not think that any single inspecting officer's report would be reliable, as to either passing a man over or giving a man promotion; but if an officer had received an unfavourable report, he should be warned of it, and then upon two or three, probably three consecutive reports from different general officers, I think it would be quite right that he should be passed over, but not on a single report.

1857. But with regard to the system of confidential reports, are you satisfied generally with the system upon which they are arranged ?—My own experience as regards confidential reports, is limited to those of my own corps who have been inspected by the general officers of the different branches of the service, and my own inspections of different branches of my own corps, and my impression is, that those reports would vary very much with the men who made them, and that therefore, if promotion or non-promotion was dependent upon the special report of any individual, it would be very fallacious.

1858. What I want to know is, whether you are satisfied with the system of confidential reports, or whether any other or better system in your opinion could in your opinion be adopted, and may I ask you how long it is since you had any actual practical experience of your own of regimental reports ?—Six or seven years.

1859. You have no knowledge or experience of the system which you are aware is now in operation under which those confidential reports are very much fuller, and much more detailed than they used to be ?—No personal knowledge.

1860. Is there any system in your opinion under which, not by way of rejecting an officer, but by way of selecting him in comparison with others, the merits of officers might lead to more rapid promotion in time of peace ?—I do not think there is any system that I have ever heard of which would give me confidence that great injustice was not done to individuals by superseding them by others who might have been more fortunate in being brought under the special notice of the individuals who recommend them for promotion. Nor do I consider that a competitive examination or any examination as to their capacity would afford any fair criterion by which to judge of the fitness of an officer for promotion.

1861. Do you rate examination as a mode of testing intellectual acquirements very high as a proof of the qualities of an officer for command or promotion ?—No ; an examination that would prove that a man has high intellectual power, would certainly be one point gained, but another man who had equal intellectual power might from the exigencies of the service not have had the same opportunities of cultivating this power, and therefore could not pass so good an examination, although he might be far the better man of the two in the field.

1862. Passing by the intellectual acquirement, are there not many other qualities required of an officer which are quite as valuable ?—Not as to which you could examine him.

1863. An examination would afford you no means of testing the various qualities which go to the making of a good officer ; it only tests one out of many ?—That is all.

1864. With regard to the staff, do you think that that is a system which requires any larger development ?—Yes, I think it might be developed to a considerable extent by throwing open the power of being examined as much as possible to officers generally in the army without their attending at the Staff College, and with that view that the examination should be of a general character.

1865. That is to say, you would give more opportunities than are at present afforded to men receiving certificates after examination at the Staff College, but without receiving instructions in the college itself ?—Quite so ; that the Staff College should fill the position more of examiners of those who are outside, although there may be a certain number educated within it, and that that examination should be conducted elsewhere than at the Staff College, so as not to render it necessary for officers to go there.

1866. Do you think that those who go to the Staff College always go with a desire to improve themselves, or that they sometimes go with collateral motives ?—There is no doubt that the motive in many cases has been to obtain a permanent position for some time so as to avoid moving about with a regiment which to a man with a family is a serious inconvenience ; at the same time those officers have the very laudable desire of improving themselves professionally. I would not say that they had gone solely for one object, but that has had a great deal to do with deciding them to endeavour to go.

1866*a*. We have been told that the junior staff appointments have, as a rule, been given to men who have passed the Staff College, do you think that a restriction of that sort is necessary, or that it would be desirable to alter it in any way ?—I think it very desirable that officers should pass some examination before getting staff appointments, and if the examinations were thrown open to the whole army, as I have just suggested, then I think there would be no hardship in requiring officers who desire staff appointments to go through the Staff College examination. At the same time on service I do not think staff appointments should be limited to Staff College candidates. Many good men might turn up in the field who might make excellent staff officers who had never had an opportunity of going to the Staff College and whose qualities would not be known until they had been tested in the presence of the enemy.

1867. With reference to entrance to the army, do you think that the system of competitive examination is a desirable one ?—That is a point as to which I have given evidence before other Commissions some years ago. Before the artillery and engineers were thrown open to competition, I thought that competition would be the ruin of those two services, but I must say that my experience, having commanded I suppose personally one-third of the officers of the engineers, and having now had experience of the Academy at Woolwich for several years, is that we get men who are quite equal in social position to those whom we got before, and who are certainly quite as well if not better educated than those that we used to get in former days ; I think therefore that competition will not in any way damage or prevent that class of men from entering the army who have hitherto entered the army.

1868. You think that, notwithstanding the competitive system, the men who enter the army now are much the same as those who did before ?—Much the same.

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lintorn Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

1869. There are some I suppose who would be excluded by it, are there not?—There are some no doubt, but I speak after some experience of Woolwich; in carrying out this competitive system very great care should be taken that the examinations do not conduce to that awful evil of cramming, and I think it may be prevented, but there is no doubt about its existence. I had about a year and a half ago to bring before the Secretary of State for War the condition of the academy which to my mind was not at that time satisfactory as regards the education of the candidates who entered it. We were not getting the candidates that we required, and the reason was that the examination for admission was not adapted to give us the raw material that we wanted.

1870. Do you mean that you were falling short of candidates, or that those that came were not of the right sort?—Those that came were not of the right sort in respect of education. Under the change in the system of examination which will come into force in July, I hope we shall get a better result, but the attempt now is to try and defeat the crammer; I hope we shall do so, and I think we shall.

1871. How long have you suffered from that trouble of not getting the right sort of candidates?—We have suffered from it for about three years. After the experience gained in three or four competitive examinations when I found that I was not getting the material that I wanted, I represented it to the Secretary of State, and he has authorized a change in the regulations; but it requires about a year and a half to bring that change into operation, because notice has to be given to the different educational establishments in the country of any change of that sort before bringing it into force.

1872. How long has the competitive system been in operation altogether?—At Woolwich, I think from 15 to 20 years. That is a good trial of it, and I must say that the social position of the candidates now in the academy who have entered it by open competition and their conduct are everything that I could desire.

1873. Before the competitive system was introduced into the artillery and engineers, the class of men who entered the artillery and engineers, was not exactly the same, was it, as those who entered the line, because it implied more work even before competitive examination was introduced?—I think they were in the same social position, with this difference, that there were not so many monied men; it was a poorer branch of the service, but the younger sons and younger brothers of people in the middle classes of life were in it.

1875. Men who were willing to undertake a certain amount of intellectual labour in entering this scientific corps because there was an examination, was there not?—Yes, there was a tolerably strong examination; I think what has tended to keep up our standard has been that there are a few good prizes in the engineers; and in the same way, as in the church or the law, the prospect of a few good prizes draws a great many. I think this operates very largely with us, otherwise I cannot, for my own part, comprehend how any man would enter the artillery or the engineers at the present day, because we are at immense disadvantage. The cadets at the academy pay for their education very largely, whilst a young officer who enters any other branch of the service receives pay immediately upon passing a similar examination to that which would bring him into the academy as a cadet.

1876. Notwishstanding that you have no lack of candidates?—As yet we have not. I do not think the public are fully aware of the circumstances, but so it is. I may state, as a case in point, that a youngster who failed at a competitive examination for Woolwich went up three or four months afterwards and entered the army, and immediately received pay as an officer, whereas those who had competed successfully against him for entrance into Woolwich have to continue, after he was gazetted, for two years at Woolwich before they can possibly get their Commissions, their parents paying 125*l.* a year for their education, and they being subject to removal at any period during those two years if they fail in their examinations.

1877. What are the prizes to which you have alluded?—There are a few good appointments; the engineer officers having been hitherto employed considerably in civil employments, and positions of that sort.

1878. Passing from the lieutenant-colonels upwards to the general officers, what is your opinion as to the desirability of a man being restricted from holding the command of a regiment for more than five years which you are aware is the rule at present?—I think myself that a wiser rule would be to make men leave the service by age.

1879. What age would you fix? Would you draw a hard and fast line, and say that when they arrive at that age they must go?—Yes, particularly in the higher ranks.

1880. What would that age be?—I think there should be a strict division between the effective and non-effective lists as there is in the navy, the artillery and engineers, that, if a man once passes from the effective list he should not be employed again except that he passed from it from temporary illness, as is the case in the artillery and engineers, when he might be brought back again after a year or two; but, otherwise, once he was on the non-effective list I would keep him there, because after a few years' absence, changes have been so rapid of late years, few men are fit to take up a command again.

1881. How would you get them on to the non-effective list?—I would place all generals and lieutenant-generals on the non-effective list at the age of 65, or at any age if a man had not had an active command for 10 years; I should consider him not fit to resume his command. A major-general at the age of 60, or if he had not an had active command for 10 years; a colonel at 55, or if he had not had an active command for seven years; a lieutenant-colonel at 50, or if he had not had an active command for five years; and a major at 45, or if he had not had an active command for five years.

1882. I understand that you would put an alternative? You say you would retire a man in every one of those different grades, and retire a man if he either attained a certain age still remaining in that rank, or if, although he had not attained that age, he has nevertheless been unemployed actively for the certain number of years which you have fixed to each grade?—Yes.

1883. Have you made any estimate of the result of a system of that sort as to the number of men that would be cast out of theservice?—No, I have not had time to do that; but it would be a very large number in the higher ranks, and I think in that case you would have to do as they have done in the royal navy, establish an effective establishment for each of the superior ranks, an active establishment for each rank, and that it would be very much smaller than the present number that you have in the army list.

1884. Take the case of the rank of lieutenant-colonels, how would you work it out?—The first thing necessary would be to fix the number of active lieutenant-colonels that you mean to have in each branch of the service.

1885. Let us take the infantry of the line as a sample, you would fix the number of lieutenant-colonels that you meant to have?—Yes.

1886. If your rule, when it came to be applied, of putting a man on the non-effective list after he had attained a certain age, was to cast out so many men that your list of lieutenant-colonels would not be complete, you would not act upon it?—There must be a certain transition period in the adoption of any system of promotion with reference to the army. There must be a certain departure from regulation in fitting the present system to anything new that you adopt; but I mean that if you adopt that system, I would make it a hard and fast rule that on arriving at a certain age, or if he had not had active employment within a certain time, he should be put on one side and the next man promoted in his place.

1887. In the questions which I am putting I am assuming the state of the future army, so that the matter is not in any way trammelled by the existing state of things; but looking at the system as one which is to be in action in the future, what I want to know is this: You say that taking a certain age, say 50 for a lieutenant-colonel, a lieutenant-colonel having arrived at that age should be put on the retired list?—Yes.

1888. Then you also say that you think there ought to be a certain number of lieutenant-colonels, what we may call a fixed establishment of lieutenant-colonels, whatever their number may be, whether 300 or 400 or 500?—Yes.

1889. Supposing that your rule as to age operated so as to cast out so many lieutenant-colonels that your list was not complete, which rule would give way? Would you say I want to keep up the existing 500 lieutenant-colonels, or would you say that the rule as to casting out these men at that age need not be applied, because I find I have still room for them?—I would cast them out, and promote those below, and it is in that way I would keep the flow of promotion. When once the system was established, I should not anticipate that it would go by great batches, but that it would give a tolerably steady flow of promotion. Of course, as I said before, the change from the present to the future is another thing.

1890. Then the flow of promotion would be regulated by those ages which you fix?—Quite so.

1891. In fixing the ages, have you made any calculation of the flow of promotion which would be thereby produced?—I have not worked it out.

1892. Those ages which you fix might turn out to make the flow of promotion too rapid or too slow, might they not?—The ages that I have stated were not fixed by me at all; but I have taken the warrant for promotion in the navy, and applied it to our own service, and I think it is a very reasonable presumption that if it is found to work well there it might work well with us, and I see no reason why a lieutenant-colonel, for instance, should be more fit for service at 50 in the army than a commander in the navy. On the contrary, a lieutenant-colonel in the army who is more exposed and who has greater demands upon his physical powers in active warfare than a commander in the navy, should be, looking to the efficiency of the service, if anything, retired earlier rather than later than in the navy.

1893. You are in favour, are you not, of the field officers in the army being tolerably young in order to do their duties well?—Yes, certainly; I conceive that a man cannot do his duty properly if he has not got the physical power to do it. As a man gets up in the service he has more luxuries around him, and he is not called upon to endure the same physical fatigues as when in a lower rank; he nurses himself a little, so that he is able to go on longer with good results. It is upon that principle that generals may be older than colonels, colonels than lieutenant-colonels, lieutenant-colonels than majors, and majors than captains.

1894. How old do you think an officer ought to be to command a regiment with efficiency in time of active service?—I put the extreme age at 50. Some men might go on longer, and some men would give out younger, but taking the Navy Regulations as a guide I see no reason why I should vary from it. I think it is a very fair age to take, that a man should not command a regiment after 50.

1895. In the suggestions which you have made will you allow me to point out that there are two opposite points of view in which the subject may be regarded in fixing the time when a man ought to be put upon the retired list. You may look at it in the point of view of which we have been speaking, namely, a man's probable efficiency with regard to physical activity and physical capacity at that period of life—that is one point of view; but another and a totally different point of view arises out of the question of promotion. A man may be very fit to discharge his duties physically in a particular rank, and yet it may be very desirable that he should be removed from that rank and placed upon the retired list in order to make way for others. Which of the two views is it which have regulated your mind in forming your mind?—Both. I think you must adopt some system of removing men from the higher ranks in order to get a flow of promotion; and I think in removing them you should try to fix the retirement at an age at which they cease under ordinary circumstances to be able to fulfil the active duties of the ranks from which they are to be removed.

1896. Therefore, both views ought to be held in the mind in fixing the age?—Yes.

1897. But the ages which you have fixed have been taken as I understand from the ages in the navy?—Yes. I should not have mentioned them if I had not considered the subject from both points of view.

1898. Have they succeeded in giving an adequate flow of promotion in the navy?—It has not been long established, but from what I hear it is going on fairly.

1899. How long has it been in vogue in the navy?—It has been established now, I think, five years.

1900. Is there not at the present time a great stagnation in the navy which is very much complained of?—It is nothing to what it was formerly. I think we can hardly judge of things from the actual state of things at the moment in which we are. I have seen, for instance, since I have been in the service, moments when officers have been quite heart-broken at the stagnation there has been in the Ordnance Corps; but within a year, perhaps, the promotion has been going on with unheard-of rapidity. It is subject to fluctuations. I may mention, with regard to the artillery and the engineers, that the average flow for many years has been sufficient to demand 70 young officers to fill 70 vacancies *per annum*. In some years the demand may go up to 100, in other years it may drop down to 50; when it drops down to 50 you will hear a great deal of grumbling; but taking the promotion over a certain number of years, you get a fair flow; promotion becomes equalized.

1901. Probably, in looking at the flow of promotion, it is your opinion that you ought not to look at the events of a particular year, but ought to take a group of years together?—Yes, certainly.

1902. You would think that flow of promotion satisfactory which gave satisfaction taking several years together?—Yes.

1903. How many years together would you say, would three or four be sufficient?—I should think that that was full short; taking one with another, probably five years would give a fair average of promotion.

1904. If you were devising a scheme to create what you would think a reasonable flow of promotion you would think that that scheme was reasonably successful if it gave the required promotion on the average in five years, but that it should give a steady stream and a certain rate every year?—No, that is an impossibility.

1905. But an average of five years you think would be satisfactory?—I think it would.

1906. Have you considered whether, if such a rule as you have suggested were established, it would be satisfactory at all to the army?—I think that anything that gave a fair average flow of promotion would be satisfactory. Of course there are men who are very ambitious, and who want to get on rapidly; you cannot satisfy everybody, but I think a fair average flow of promotion would give satisfaction.

1907. I will assume that what is a fair average flow of promotion would give satisfaction, but would the method of producing that promotion by turning men out of the army when they had arrived at a certain age be satisfactory?—If the retirement were liberal, or if the retirement which is adopted in the navy were adopted for the army, I believe myself that it would give perfect satisfaction.

1908. That brings us to the question of retire-

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Linton Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

ment. I presume you would give a pension, would you not?—Yes, a retired pay.

1909. What are your figures upon that point?—I have taken the figures that have been proved and are in operation with regard to the navy, substituting the relative ranks. The service in the navy is made up so largely of half-pay service that it requires some adaptation to fit their regulations to the army, but I think that this scale would work satisfactorily; a full general should retire on 850*l.* a year, having 35 years' service, and there should be added or deducted 20*l.* a year for each year he had served above or below 35 years.

1910. Are you speaking of existing generals now, would your scheme apply to them, or are you giving us the details of a scheme which would apply to the army in the future, and which if it were applied to the existing generals would be subject to modifications?—I understood you in the previous question to direct my attention to the army of the future, and that any scheme that is adopted for the army of the future must be adapted by some means or another to the present; I believe this retirement would be on such a liberal scale (I am only borrowing from the navy) that a great number of the officers of the army would readily fall into it.

1911. The general that you were speaking of to whom you were going to give this pension is to retire at what age?—He is to retire at 65 years of age or at any age if he has not had active command for 10 years, and he is to have a pension of 850*l.* a year, if he had 35 years of full pay service, with 20*l.* added or deducted for every year, according as he had more or less than 35 years' service; I would explain with regard to "service" (because I adopt the same principle in the other ranks, therefore I had better explain it here) that I would define that service on full-pay should count full time, and half-pay service one-third of full time. That is what is done in the navy, and I think it is a liberal allowance and would quite meet what is required; service with the militia or with the auxiliary forces (I contemplate that officers would in some way be attached to those auxiliary forces) should count half full time.

1912. Will you go on to the next branch?—The lieutenant-general who, as I have before said, would be retired at 65 years or at any age, if he had not actively served for 10 years, should receive 725*l.* after 34 years' service with 15*l.* added or deducted recording as his length of service was more or less than 34 years. In the same way a major-general should be retired at 60 on 600*l.* a year after 32 years' service with 10*l.* added or deducted, according as he was above or below the 32 years' service, but there should be a maximum; and here, I think, we might reasonably ask in the army for what the navy have, namely, a greater number of field marshals who receive half pay in the navy to the amount of 1,200*l.* a year, and are compulsorily retired at 70; the provision, with regard to the navy as to pension, is so calculated that any admiral shall not exceed the half pay of an admiral of the fleet or a field marshal, which is 1,200*l.* a year. You would have to fix a maximum within which they should retain their good service pensions; pensions for wounds being extra.

1913. Now will you take the case of colonels?—With regard to colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and majors, I would put them all on one scale for retirement; beginning at 55, they should retire upon 525*l.* a year, with 10*l.* more or less according as they have been more or less than 28 years in service.

1914. That applies to all three ranks?—I have got a scale that applies to all three.

1915. Does it apply to majors?—That age would not apply to majors, but a lower number of years on this scale would apply to a major. That particular age would only apply to a colonel.

1916. Supposing a major were of that age, would he come upon that scale?—No, I would retire a major compulsorily at 45, but I have made a scale of pension taking it from the navy list, and adapting it to our service for all ages, from 55 downwards to 40, because at some points in the scale a man might be retired either in the rank of a major or a lieutenant-colonel, and then they would overlap one another. Therefore, I have made the scale continuously from 55 downwards to 40.

1917. You apply it to the whole three grades generally, although it is not possible, in many cases, that some of the lower grades could be retired at the higher ages?—Quite so.

1918. Could you supply the Commission with this information in a tabular form?—Yes, I shall be very happy to do so. (*The witness handed in the following table.*)

TABLE A.—Showing a PROPOSED SCALE of RETIRED PAY according to AGE and SERVICE. An addition or deduction to be made for each full year of service or its equivalent.

Age.	Retired Pay.	Full Service or its equivalent in Militia or Half-Pay Time.	Addition or Deduction.
	£	Years.	£
Generals - - - -	850	35	20
Lieut.-generals - - -	725	34	15
Major-generals - - -	600	32	10
Colonels and all ranks below:			
At 55 - -	525	28	10
„ 54 - -	510	28	10
„ 53 - -	495	27	10
„ 52 - -	480	27	10
„ 51 - -	465	26	10
„ 50 - -	450	26	10
„ 49 - -	425	25	10
„ 48 - -	400	25	10
„ 47 - -	375	24	10
„ 46 - -	350	24	10
„ 45 - -	325	23	10
„ 44 - -	300	23	10
„ 43 - -	275	22	10
„ 42 - -	250	22	10
„ 41 - -	225	21	10
„ 40 - -	200	21	10

1919. (*Maj.-Gen Johnson.*) On what ground have you taken this number of years' service—is it merely because it is the same in the navy, or have you any particular reason?—I have taken it from the scale adopted for the navy, and have added what I thought would be a fair number of years to bring us pretty nearly on a par with the navy. I think that the army should have just as good retirement as the navy, and that just as good inducements should be held out to officers to retire, but our system being continuous service and the system of half-pay service in the navy being so different, I have tried to accommodate the two together.

1920. (*Chairman.*) How far down do you go?—To 40 years of age.

1921. What is the amount you give at 40 years of age?—Retired pay of 200*l.* a year and 10*l.* a year added or deducted, according as the officer had over or under 21 years' service.

1922. Would you have compulsory retirements on attaining a certain age?—Yes; in the case of officers who have not been employed for a certain period, I think it is a question which requires consideration, whether it might not be advisable to allow officers to retire optionally at those same scales with less service than when compulsorily retired. My own impression is that it would be advisable.

1923. Your figures that you have given us were figures and rates for compulsory retirement depending upon attaining a certain age; have you considered the propriety with a view of creating a proper flow of promotion of offering inducements to officers to retire in the various grades?—I think, subject to the approval of the authorities, that is to say, that it should not be a right to retire, but subject to the approval of the authorities, I would allow an officer to retire five years short of the period of compulsory retirement taking their retirement on this scale which I have proposed.

1924. Then the earliest period of voluntary retirement, therefore, would be at 15 years' service?—Yes.

1925. And the earliest compulsory retirement at what age?—I would make 42 the compulsory age for the retirement of a captain.

1926. That being the earliest compulsory retirement, you say that in all grades you would allow a man to retire voluntarily five years before the compulsory period, so that the result of it would be that you would not offer any voluntary retirement until a man was 37 years of age, and had had 17 or 18 years' service?—No, I would not offer a voluntary retirement with pension.

1927. Are you aware that under the purchase system the lower grades of the army were very largely emptied by men selling out, that a great part of the sales under the purchase system took place in the ranks of captains and subalterns?—Yes.

1928. It was by sales in the lower ranks that much of the promotion which has hitherto obtained in the British army has been secured as our organization gives only two majors to a regiment; if the flow of promotion is to be maintained it seems as though it must be done by, to some extent, emptying the lower ranks; do you see any objection to offering a voluntary retirement in those lower ranks?—I think that a voluntary retirement that is worth having in the lower ranks if it is in the way of a pension would be such a costly thing that it is utterly out of the question.

1929. Supposing it is not in the way of a pension but in the way of a lump sum of money as it was under the purchase system, what should you say?—Retirement by giving a lump sum of money to young officers after a few years' service, would, I think, be prejudicial to the service and productive of harm to the young men themselves. It appears from a return published in the report of Captain Vivian's committee on the retirement of officers of R.A. and R.E., that of 1,000 officers who entered purchase regiments (Guards excepted) 442 used to sell before attaining the rank of captain, or, as appears from the same report, before averaging 8·3 years' service, and 185 more before averaging 17·3 years. At the most, probably one-tenth of the officers who entered the army, or 100 out of the 442, were men of wealth and expectations who intended after passing a few years in the service to retire and follow other careers in civil life; but a very large number of the remainder were, I believe, men who hadacquired habits of extravagance beyond their means, had fallen into debt, or got into the hands of money lenders, and been compelled to realize their commissions. In fact they were men who had been ruined by the facilities afforded them for running into debt, and whose careers were thus blasted at the very threshold of life. To such an extent was money lending carried that I have known the case of a lad on getting his commission receiving from 60 to 70 letters from money lenders offering to advance money. This shows what these unscrupulous villains will do when the only security that could be given in most cases was the value of the commission. What I should fear is that, if an officer acquired a right to a lump sum of money after a few years service, an impetus would be given to money lenders, and temptations be placed in the way of thoughtless boys when first sent from their homes into the world, who would otherwise be compelled to restrain themselves from extravagance or be pulled up by their friends at the outset of their careers in the army, if they should exceed their means. Under the purchase system it was only the officers who had actually purchased who received money on the sale of their commissions after a few years service, and they only as a rule received back what they had paid. They were neither the richer nor the poorer for their short service in the army. Now, I don't think that class of men would be much affected in their proceedings by a small sum of money, but I fear that the right to such a sum might bring ruin to a large number of young men without really benefitting anyone. Much of the extravagance in the army, which has been one of its greatest evils, was to be attributed to the facilities with which young men could obtain credit. The abolition of purchase has contributed much to check it, and I trust nothing may be done to give it a fresh impetus. I would rather retire such men in another way. Men might be encouraged to come into the army for a few years who do not intend to make it their profession, by the prospect of serving afterwards in the auxiliary forces. The men who would come into the army in that way are not men who are looking for money, but for employment for a few years until they can either come into their properties, or can assume a position in their respective counties or wherever they might happen to be. I think it would be a very good thing not to allow officers to enter the auxiliary forces at all after a certain time unless they have gone through certain work in the army. For instance, young men might be encouraged to enter the army by giving lieutenants who had served for five years the offer of commissions as captains in the militia or the auxiliary forces. In the same way I would encourage a captain of two years' service as such to retire, giving him the offer of a majority in the militia. Also with the view to officering the militia with men who understood their work, and had been trained, I would render all retiring officers liable to serve, in any way, in case of necessity, with any of the auxiliary forces. The officers who had been retired compulsorily might be drafted into a militia regiment with a step of rank; for instance, a major retired compulsorily at 45, might be passed into the militia with the rank of lieutenant-colonel if there was a vacancy for him, after which I would allow that two years' service in the militia should count as one in increasing his pension so as to encourage men to retire rather before that age, after which they could still continue to improve their position by serving with a higher rank in the militia; I think this would tend to keep a flow of promotion.

1930. You mentioned that you would have a certain fixed number of lieutenant-colonels; do you apply

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lintorn Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

that observation to the other ranks in the same way to a fixed number of captains and a fixed number of lieutenants?—I think that the basis of all promotion should be a fixed establishment of each rank for the whole army. I have taken some little trouble to work the question out with reference to another matter, and I have the result here. For instance, I think the unit that has been adopted in the artillery, of a major, a captain, and three subalterns to a battery, might with very great advantage, both tactically and economically, be extended to the other branches of the service. In the infantry, by making double companies, commanded by a major with a captain, and three subalterns under him, to every double company, and in the cavalry by breaking the regiments up into squadrons instead of troops, with a major, a captain, and three subalterns to constitute the squadron officers; I believe this would tend to very great economy. At the present time it is a little difficult to understand what the organization of a battalion is, for it is impossible, I believe, to make any system out of it. At present you have regiments with two, three, and four battalions; you have battalions with 25, 26, 27, and up to 33 officers in each, and they are divided for the most part into a variety of companies, some with 13 and others with 20 subalterns. Some companies have one lieutenant, whilst others have two. The battalions are of various strengths. (*The witness here handed in the following tables B and C.*)

TABLE B.—Showing the EXISTING ESTABLISHMENTS for OFFICERS of the INFANTRY as fixed by W.O. Circular of 1st April 1875. (Exclusive of Colonels.)

Rank, exclusive of Colonels, Commandant, Paymasters, and Surgeons	Guards, 7 Battalions.		Infantry of the Line.														Total Infantry, 150 Battalions 68 Depôts.
			At Home, 70 Battalions.		In Colonies, 21 Battalions.		West India Regiments, 2 Battalions.		In India, 50 Battalions.		Depôt Brigades, 68.						
	For One Battalion.	Total.	For One Battalion.	Total.	For One Battalion.	Total.	For One Battalion.	Total.	For One Battalion.	Total.	65 each.	1.	1.	1.	Total.		
Lieut.-colonels	3	3	1	70	1	21	2	4	1	50	1	1	1	—	67		215
Majors	1	7	1	*72	2	42	2	4	2	†99	1	1	2	2	70		294
Captains	10	70	8	560	8	168	11	22	8	400	‡4	6	6	6	278		1,498
Lieutenants	20	140	13	910	18	378	33	66	17	850	4	6	4	4	274		2,618
Adjutants	1	7	1	70	1	21	1	2	1	50	—	—	—	—	—		150
Quartermasters	1	7	1	70	1	21	1	2	1	50	1	1	1	—	67		217
	33⅓	234	25	1,752	31	651	50	100	30	1,499	11	15	14	12	756		4,992
N.C. officers, rank and file	—	5,710	—	42,564	—	15,432	—	1,728	—	44,312	—	—	—	—	8,971		118,717

* One major additional in two battalions.
† One major less in one battalion.
‡ Exclusive of two captains in each depôt for duty as adjutants of militia.

TABLE C.—Showing the PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENTS for OFFICERS of the INFANTRY.

Rank.	For One Battalion throughout.	Guards, 7 Battalions.	At Home, 80 Battalions.	In Colonies, 16 Battalions.	W. India Regiments, 2 Battalions.	In India 45 Battalions.	14 Depôts.		Total Infantry, 150 Battalions 14 Depôts.
							Each.	Total.	
Lieut.-colonels	1	7	80	16	2	45	1	14	164
Majors	4	28	320	64	8	180	2	28	628
Captains	4	28	320	64	8	180	2	28	628
Lieutenants	12	84	960	192	24	540	6	84	1,884
Adjutants	1	7	80	16	2	45	—	—	150
Quartermasters	1	7	80	16	2	45	1	14	164
	23	161	1,840	368	46	1,035	12	168	3,618
N.C. officers, rank and file — On peace establishment	—	5,710	69 battalions 31,050	—	1,728	—	8,279		118,717
N.C. officers, rank and file — On war establishment	—	—	11 battalions 11,000	16,000	—	45,000	—		
			42,500						

All battalions to be either on peace or war establishments. All battalions abroad to be on the latter, and 11 battalions at home next for foreign service. The proposed cadre of officers should be kept complete. All officers specially employed on the staff, at the Staff College or otherwise, to be seconded or made supernumerary. All special regimental instructors (not schoolmasters) to be abolished; the instruction of the officers and men of each double company being thrown upon the officer commanding it, assisted by his subordinate officers and N.C. officers. If a second captain or a fourth lieutenant were considered necessary in each double company of battalions abroad, and of those next for foreign service, the number of officers would be increased by 296. The number of captains or lieutenants would thus be 916 instead of 628, or 2,172 instead of 1,884, and the total number of officers 3,914 instead of 3,618.

1931. Is that condition of things which you have just mentioned casual, or is it the existing system?—It is the existing system.

1932. Do you mean, by what you have stated to us, that the permanent establishment was not filled, or that there have been some vacancies that have not been filled up?—No, these are the fixed establishments.

1933. What is the authority that you are speaking from?—I have extracted this from the army circulars; they are the establishments fixed by the army circular dated the 1st of April 1875. In the Guards there are 33 officers to a battalion with 10 companies. The first battalion of the first regiment has 26 officers, the second battalion of the first regiment has 30 officers,

1934. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Is not the reason for that that the one is at home and the other is abroad?—Yes, but the foreign battalion of the second regiment has 31 officers, and the home battalion has 25 officers. There you have already three strengths for the home battalions, and two for the foreign battalions; and I have only alluded to three regiments.

1935. (*Chairman.*) Is this the result of an accident or a scheme, or what has it arisen from?—I cannot say.

1936. Do those variations which you have mentioned arise in any degree from the fact that regiments are changed from foreign to home service, and that one strength is required for foreign service and another for home service?—No, I do not think they do. I cannot comprehend them. Take for instance the establishment headed "A" in the table before me. That establishment consists for the home battalion of one lieutenant-colonel, one major, eight captains, 13 lieutenants, one adjutant, and one quartermaster. The foreign battalion consists of one lieutenant-colonel, two majors, eight captains, 17 subalterns, one adjutant, and one quartermaster. For my part I cannot conceive why the establishment of a regiment should not be based upon the company organization. If there are eight companies which I do not hold to at all as a good number, it is just as necessary at home that one company should have two subalterns as that the others should. I believe that the same cadre would be efficient both for home and for foreign service if they were maintained full; the only difference being that the foreign battalion should be made up to the war strength in men, whereas the home battalion being on the peace establishment as regards men would require to be made up from the reserves if necessary to the war strength without changing or altrring its number of officers. I think that that is the true principle for the army.

1937. The true principle of the army would be to keep the establishment of officers on the same footing that would be required in time of war?—Quite so.

1938. And filling up the rank and file as they are required?—Yes.

1939. Then you do not see any reason to account for these variations?—I must say that I cannot comprehend them, they puzzle me. If this principle were recognized then the organization which I have ventured to suggest would be for an infantry regiment at home or abroad, one lieutenant-colonel, four majors, four captains, 12 subalterns, one adjutant, and one quartermaster, which makes 23 officers, which I would make uniform exclusive of officers at the depôts; and I think that the best system of depôts is very much what has been adopted in the artillery, and that one lieutenant-colonel, with two majors, and two captains, and six subalterns (that is the equivalent to two double companies) would be quite sufficient officers to form a depôt for seven or eight regiments.

1940. (*Lord Hampton.*) Then, according to that organization, one field officer would be enough?—Yes, one regimental field officer as distinct from the double-company officers; he is assisted by an adjutant. I go a step further; I would do away with special instructors throughout the army and throw upon the majors commanding double companies, and upon the majors commanding squadrons of cavalry, the duty of instructing their officers and men; I think the best examination as to a man's capacity for promotion would be that his officers and men were thoroughly instructed, which would be a real test as to a man's efficiency or not when he was passed over. The result of these changes would be this; there will be 756 officers in the infantry of the line employed, when they are brought to their full strength, at 68 depôts; there are 1,752 officers in the 70 battalions at home, according to their establishments; there are 751 officers in the 21 battalions in the colonies, and there are 50 battalions in India with 1,499 officers, making a total according to their establishments of 4,758 regimental officers of infantry of all ranks. If what I venture to suggest were carried out, there would be 168 officers at the depôts, 1,840 in the battalions at home, 414 in the colonies, and 1,035 in India, giving a total of 3,457 officers as against 4,757. I believe that the army with that number of officers would be fully as efficiently officered for service, and that the variation of the proportions in the higher ranks would tend to give a much more satisfactory flow of promotion.

1941. You think the number of officers at present in the army is much larger than is necessary?—Quite so.

1942. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do those figures include the non-combatant officers?—No, surgeons are not on the establishment.

1943. (*Chairman.*) Can you give the commission the figures for the cavalry?—Following out the system of squadron organization, which gives more officers in the higher ranks, you would have 637 officers where now you have 842. (*The witness here handed in the following table D.*)

TABLE D.—Showing EXISTING and PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENTS for OFFICERS of CAVALRY.

Ranks.	Existing Establishments.					Proposed Establishments.				
	British.			Indian.	Total.	British.			Indian.	Total.
	Household Cavalry. — 3 Regiments.	Cavalry of the Line. — 19 Regiments.	Depôts.	Cavalry of the Line. — 9 Regiments.		Household Cavalry. — 3 Regiments.	Cavalry of the Line. — 21 Regiments.	Depôts. — 7 Depôts	Cavalry of the Line. — 7 Regiments.	
Lieut.-colonels	1	1	3	1	34	1	1	—	1	31
Majors	1	1	1	1	32	2	3	1	3	97
Captains	8	8	—	7	239	2	3	1	3	97
Lieutenants	12	13	—	14	409	6	9	3	12	312
Adjutants	1	1	1	1	32	1	1	—	1	31
Riding-masters	1	1	1	1	32	—	—	1	—	7
Quartermasters	1	1	1	1	32	1	1	—	1	31
Veterinary surgeons	1	1	1	1	32	1	1	—	1	31
Totals	26	27	8	27	842	14	19	6	22	637

The proposed cadre of officers should be kept complete.

All officers specially employed on the staff, at the Staff College, or otherwise, to be seconded or made supernumerary.

All special regimental instructors (not schoolmasters) to be abolished, the instruction of the officers and men of each squadron being thrown upon the officer commanding it, assisted by his subordinate officers and non-commissioned officers.

A fourth lieutenant has been added for each squadron of regiments abroad.

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lintorn Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

1944. Subject to the remarks which you have been making as to compulsory retirement after a certain age, would you interfere with the present system of a fixed establishment of general officers, or would you put them into two lists?—I would separate throughout the whole army the active or effective from the non-effective of all ranks, and in that case, if you had a compulsory retirement, the number of general officers on the active list would be very different from the number that is now on the list.

1945. What would constitute the active list amongst the general officers?—All men who remained on the list who had not been retired at the fixed age, or, in other words, men who had not arrived at the fixed age, having been promoted from lower ranks for their previous service.

1946. In the case of a lieutenant-colonel, supposing he had not arrived at a compulsory age for retirement, and supposing that his five years' command of a regiment had elapsed, what would you do with him, would you put him on half pay as he is put now, or how would you deal with him?—I should allow him to continue in his present employment if he was fit to hold it.

1947. You would not approve of the five years' rule as a method of promotion?—No, certainly not.

1948. You would apply it only in cases where an individual was not very competent for his duties, or incapacited from physical infirmities?—I would then put him in the retired list, so that he could not come back again in a higher rank on the active list.

1949. Do you think that the present system, of a lieutenant-colonel after getting his command of a regiment, going on half pay and remaining so for several years before he attained the rank of major-general, an undesirable one in itself?—Most undesirable, especially of late years where there have been such rapid changes going on; I think it is very difficult for a man after he has been eight or ten years out of the coach, to pick up the reins and go on afterwards; and I think it is very undesirable that he should do so. At the same time I think that the regulation adopted in the navy is a very sound one, and that the retirement from the active list ought not to disqualifiy any officer for employment, at or under the War Office, I mean any civil employment. A man for instance might be in the position which Sir Edward Lugard formerly filled in this office, or the Director of Ordnance, where his years and experience might be of great advantage, and he is not required to be active in the field.

1950. With regard to appointments on the staff, what is your opinion upon that subject; would you interfere with the present system?—No, I do not know that I should. The present system is one by selection, but the value of the staff entirely depends upon the judgment of those who have the power of selection and I do not think it can be left in better hands than it is at present. I would make it in peace time subject after a certain number of years to officers having passed certain examinations, and not to the accident of their having passed the Staff College.

1951. Are you in favour of officers who have once been on the staff and served say four or five years there being re-appointed and continuing to serve on the staff, or are you in favour of the opposite system of spreading the staff appointments more widely over the regimental officers?—From having seen on service in the Crimea, the failure of the French system of staff employment by which officers were continued on the staff for the term of their natural lives (just at the end of the war it was beginning to fail), I think it far more advantageous that service on the staff should be limited to five years so that there may be a reserve of staff officers throughout the army who, in the event of a war, might be called upon to fill staff employments. An officer should not be re-eligible to serve on the staff in peace time until after a certain period had elapsed, during which he had served with his regiment, or if he happened to be in higher rank in an active command.

1952. With regard to promotion by brevet as a reward for distinguished conduct, is that a system which you think ought to be maintained?—I think, as regards distinguished conduct, power should be given as in the navy to promote a man from one rank to another provided he had served a certain minimum of time in that rank. For instance, a major might be promoted to lieutenant-colonel for distinguished service in the field if he had served a certain time, say two or three years, in his rank as major.

1953. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Are you talking now of brevet rank?—No, of absolute rank.

1954. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that the system of giving brevet promotion for distinguished services is a desirable one?—I think it would be better to give actual promotion.

1955. That is to say, substantive rank and active employment?—Yes, quite so.

1956. Do you think that the system of rewarding a man by giving him army rank merely is not a desirable one?—As it works at present it is no reward at all in some cases. In my own case I have benefited enormously by it. I suppose there is no man in the army who has done more so. I have only had two steps by brevet and I owe my present position and pay to brevet rank, therefore I ought not to speak against it; but in some cases it is no benefit whatever. For instance, I have an officer at the present moment under my command who has been lieutenant-colonel, I think, for four or five years by brevet; he is just promoted to a regimental lieutenant-colonelcy, and the whole of the brevet service he had as lieutenant-colonel is lost to him. He takes his position in the corps as lieutenant-colonel according to the date of his regimental promotion; none of his previous services as brevet lieutenant-colonel is counted for him towards getting his colonel's rank and, therefore, he has derived no permanent benefit whatever from it.

1957. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) He takes precedence in the army, does he not; that is to say, he will take rank before a lieutenant-colonel of a date subsequent to his getting his brevet rank?—If two lieutenant-colonels happen to come together in the same garrison and he were senior he would take precedence in taking the command, but that is not a case which often occurs.

1958. (*Chairman.*) Although he got brevet rank of lieutenant-colonel he never got the substantive rank of lieutenant-colonel until a period when he would have got it all the same without brevet rank until he attained it in the course of regimental promotion?—Just so.

1959. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) If that is so, you got made brevet major first of all did you not?—Yes.

1960. And then brevet lieutenant-colonel?—Yes.

1961. How did you in the same regiment get an advantage by that which this gentleman would be precluded from getting?—Because the regulations were somewhat different, and it so happened that I was employed, whilst brevet lieutenant-colonel, in a position which entitled me to count that service as lieutenant-colonel's service towards promotion to full colonel. I got my full colonelcy by rotation, after completing so many years service.

1962. (*Chairman.*) In general, brevet rank is no doubt an advantage to a man?—No doubt it is.

1963. On the other hand it is found that it produces some anomalies in the shape of a man serving as a captain in a regiment, when at the same time he is lieutenant-colonel in army rank?—Yes.

1964. And therefore he is senior in the army sometimes to those under whom he is serving?—Yes. I have been in a garrison myself with a regimental captain who by virtue of his being brevet full colonel commanded the garrison in which his own regiment was stationed.

1965. And therefore commanded his own lieutenant-colonel?—Yes, I have seen that.

1966. Are you of opinion that brevet rank for distinguished service has been too freely given of late years?—Yes.

1967. Is it not customary for the general officer in active service to mention in his despatches the name of

every officer holding a staff appointment of a certain rank as well as all officers commanding regiments and troops and batteries of artillery, and upon their being so named they get breve promotion ?—Yes, that is generally the custom.

1968. With regard to the men so promoted, the majority of them, I suppose, have simply done their duty in that position and have not done anything that deserves the name of distinguished conduct ?—No, as a general rule a great many of them have not; a great many have, but a great many have not; there is no doubt about that, and in some cases they have been promoted without even that recommendation; they have not been even recommended by the general in his official dispatches.

1969. What would you think of some system by which, instead of giving brevet rank, an officer who had distinguished himself in active service should receive a good service pension, or some decoration, or a reward in some other direction than that of brevet ?—I think that promotion is what most men are most anxious for, and that for distinguished gallantry in the field or distinguished actions, it is very desirable that a man should be promoted to a higher rank, but I would make it substantive rank instead of brevet rank.

1970. That is for really distinguished conduct, but then there would be a class of men besides who may have held those posts to which I have just now been referring and whose names would only be mentioned in the despatches of the general officer commanding, and it might be desirable, might it not, to give them some reward ?—Good service pensions are one way of rewarding them, and, no doubt, they would be very much esteemed. There is also a way of rewarding them by decoration and by their names being recorded in the "Gazette."

1971. What do you think of that method of rewarding people; do you see any objection to it ?—No, I see no objection to it, but I should prefer myself its not being made a reward; I should prefer myself the honorary distinction of a decoration, it is a much more worthy way of rewarding good service than by a sum of money.

1972. But some system might be adopted, might there not, which would carry the two together as the Legion of Honour does in France ?—Yes, some system might be adopted of that sort.

1973. If your scheme of organization were adopted the difficulty of the supersession of the different branches of the service might be to some extent got over, and, probably would be, whereas at present owing to a different regulation rather from that of the artillery, there will always be a danger, will there not, of one branch of the service superseding the other in rank ?—If the two services were organized on somewhat of an equal basis, as has been the case in the artillery and the engineers, supersession to a limited extent will always take place, but these two corps run together, one is ahead at one time and the other ahead at another, but taking them in the long run the promotion is about equal in both. There is no permanent supersession. It would be a great benefit from having a similar organization throughout all the branches of the service that supersession would in great measure cease, at any rate, supersession to an injurious extent.

1974. Supposing that that scheme was not adopted, and that the present organization of the infantry were maintained, have you thought of any system by which supersession could be avoided ?—I do not see how it is to be avoided otherwise than by what I have said. I would allow, as I have stated before, regimental supersession to the extent of two years. Where it amounted to more than two years the promotion should be upon the general list.

1975. Supposing you maintain the existing organization of the infantry, and do not assimilate it to the artillery, do you see any mode by which the supersession of one branch over the other might be avoided ?—No, I do not see my way to avoiding it. There always has been supersession in different branches of the service, and there has been supersession with respect to different regiments of the same branch; no two regiments have been promoted equally. There has been supersession going on in upwards of 100 different lists since ever I have known the army.

1976. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) There used to be no supersession after the rank of colonel in the olden times ?—No, not in the higher ranks, but I was alluding to the lower regimental ranks.

1977. (*Chairman.*) My question was with reference to supersession in the rank of general, and a man coming to the rank of general so much earlier ?—No, I do not see that there is any way of preventing it if the present system is maintained.

1978. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you think a dead level altogether a thing to be desired ?—No, not at all.

1979. (*Chairman.*) It is desirable, is it not, that there should be some officers who go forward more rapidly than others ?—Yes, provided that they go forward upon some fair recognised system that is understood by all, and that it is not left to interest.

1980. You have not, I suppose, calculated at all the cost of such a scheme of retirement as you have shadowed out ?—No, I have not, because it would involve considerable labour to attempt it and a good deal of actuarial work, but I think that if once the army were brought into the organization which I have shadowed out it would not be a very expensive system, not so expensive as the present one.

1981. That is to say, the scheme of retirement should be taken with your scheme of re-organization ?—Yes, based upon some fixed establishment. I do not mean to say that mine is absolutely the best, but it should be based upon some fixed establishment of officers. It is those fluctuations in the establishment which cause great difficulties in carrying out any system of promotion, and I do not see why a peace organization should not be adapted to war.

1982. You speak of fluctuations in the establishment, what are you alluding to under that name; you do not mean, I presume, mere discrepancies between the establishment of one regiment and that of another ?—No, I refer to the constant fluctuations. This army circular which I hold in my hand comes out about every year, and if you compare the strength of different corps this year with what it was last you will find fluctuations; I have never been able to discover any reason for these fluctuations, or any principle which has governed them.

1983. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Do you mean fluctuations in the strength of the army or fluctuations in the arrangements ?—Fluctuations in the arrangements.

1984. (*Chairman.*) I thought that the number of officers forming the establishment had been maintained at about the same from year to year ?—There has been a good deal of fluctuation. In the particular branch of the service with which I am connected I have to supply officers to fill up vacancies from casualties in the artillery and engineers. The total number of officers in the fixed establishment of the artillery last year was 1,286, and this year it is 1,300; the number of men continuing the same. There has been some little change in the organization. If those organizations had been all previously settled that slight change would not have occurred. There are similar things constantly going on. Take, for instance, a regiment of cavalry; a regiment of cavalry in India has seven captains, it comes home and immediately it has eight captains. A regiment at home has eight captains and 13 subalterns, it goes to India and it will have seven captains and 14 subalterns, so that it diminishes one captain and increases a subaltern.

1985. With regard to retirements in the artillery, can you tell us why it is that the retirements, which seem considerable in amount, are not accepted in the artillery ?—They are not sufficient, because the pay and emoluments are better than the retirements that are offered. For instance, a lieutenant-colonel will

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lintorn Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

not take 1*l.* a day, which is his retirement, because his pay and emoluments are considerably more.

1986. I thought that a lieutenant-colonel had a retirement of 600*l.* a year?—No, that is for full colonels.

1987. Those are not accepted, are they?—I do not know how it is in the artillery at the present moment, whether they are or are not; but in the engineers, certainly, they are not fully taken advantage of.

1988. Why is that?—Because engineer officers, when they are employed, are getting better pay. That is why I think it would be a very good thing to apply the compulsory system.

1989. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) It is pure seniority promotion in both the artillery and engineers, is it not; there is no selection or rejection whatever?—There is no selection or rejection, except in the case of brevet promotion. It is regimental until officers arrive at the rank of full colonel, and after that the promotion goes by army seniority, in their own corps; it goes by seniority in army rank instead of seniority in regimental rank. It is in that way that I have reaped the benefit of my brevet rank.

1990. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) There were a great number of officers, were there not, when you were in the regiment who were junior to you regimentally?—Yes, I never was full colonel of the regiment. I was promoted at once from regimental lieutenant-colonel to major-general.

1991. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In the examinations at the academy, as I understand, you put those young men who have been cadets into two branches of the service, the engineers or the artillery, according as they distinguish themselves, but there is a preference for the engineers?—The seniors have a right of selection, and at the present time, and for some years past, with few exceptions, the seniors have selected the engineers; but a great many years ago the artillery was the fashion, and they selected the artillery.

1992. I suppose the engineers, whether in point of emolument or some other reason, are preferred for practical reasons; it is not a mere fashion?—Just so. The emoluments are not so good when they first enter, but generally they look to more civil appointments being open to them in the higher ranks, and better appointments.

1993. Is the examination purely an intellectual one, so as to test their intellectual capacity, or do you refer to the records of the college for the character of a man, his antecedents, his habits, and his capacity in other respects as a soldier; is it a combination of what he learns in college, and what a man's character is, and what he is likely to be as a soldier?—It is decided upon marks; it is determined by his intellectual qualities, and also by his proficiency in drills and exercises, and in riding, gymnastics, and so forth.

1994. First his intellect and drills, and then his athletic power, and so forth?—Yes, which count for little, but still they do count.

1995. Do you find that they generally run together, that the lad who comes out near the top of the tree in the intellectual struggle is one who stands high in other respects as a rule?—As a general rule, yes, decidedly. I do not say that there are not others who are not good gymnasts and good in any other ways, in the lower part of the list; but as a general rule I should say that those who are higher intellectually are generally so in other respects physically.

1996. Do you find that lads who if they were tried merely in an intellectual struggle would come out best, would practically be amongst the most promising lads in the service after their examination?—Yes, with the exception of a few whose physical frames are not strong, and then the intellectual effort is almost too much for them. There are a few of that class. I remember a case which will explain what I mean. A young man who was under my command at Chatham came out head of his batch an exceedingly clever fellow, but when he came to me I could make nothing of him. He was about as stupid a youngster as I had in the place; I inquired about his previous character, and found that he was really a clever man, and I put him to regimental duty, drills, and things of that sort, and after five or six weeks he recovered the tone of his mind, and he turned out a very fine fellow. He had been exhausted with the mental strain; and that has been the case with others.

1997. (*Chairman.*) Your system of examination tests not only intellectual acquirement but physical qualities; does it also test the moral qualities at all; have you any gauge to ascertain a man's temper, or prudence, or promptitude, or decision?—Nothing, except that he is under the observation of his officers for 2½ years whilst he is in the academy.

1998. Does anything come of that observation?—If he is not fit for his position as an officer it is my duty to remove him from the academy.

1999. Is it exercised to any considerable extent?—Not to any considerable extent; but it is my painful duty now and then to remove a youngster.

2000. That would be only in the case of some very bad conduct, would it?—Very bad, but not as regards temper.

2001. You have no test or gauge for the moral qualities that go towards making a good officer in those examinations?—No. We get the raw material as boys, and we bring them up in the best way we can for 2½ years. If they by their misconduct commit themselves in any way so as stamp them as of undesirable moral character I can remove them. I think as regards the artillery and the engineers that it is a very serious matter whether or not we shall get candidates to enter them when once the public understand the disadvantages under which we are as regards entrance to the academy; unless the mode of entering the army in other branches, and in the artillery are put more upon an equality; we are at a disadvantage also as regards age.

2002. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) There is such a prohibitory tax at the entrance that you think you will get none to enter the house?—Quite so.

2003. Naturally the prohibition keeps others away because many of those who enter do not pass for a commission?—Quite so. Now ours is turned into a purchase corps; they pay so much for their commissions.

2004. The plan which you have suggested to us with regard to promotion in the army would be a revolution in the constitution of the British army altogether, would it not?—Not very much. I think it is a plan which could be very easily adapted to the present system. It would require some close study to fit the one on to the other; but I do not think there would be any insuperable difficulty in it. I think it is a system which would be exceedingly popular with the army, because it would increase the number of officers in the higher ranks. It would probably diminish the number of full colonels, and lieutenant-colonels on the active list, and generals; but it would increase the number of majors very considerably, and give a much earlier promotion to that rank.

2005. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you find that the strain that a young man has undergone in preparing for entry into the Royal Military Academy has a bad effect on his health physical or mental after joining the service?—I find that many of the lads that come to us are very much broken down by the hard system of cramming that they have gone through. I hope that the changes that are now about to take place in those examinations in which I have endeavoured to the utmost to defeat the crammers will remedy that great defect which I have found to exist to a very considerable extent.

2006. (*Chairman.*) How do you propose to defeat the crammers?—The marks that have been given for certain subjects in previous examinations can only be gained by cramming. One subject which is one of the chief sources of cramming is what they are pleased to call English literature, that means that a boy is examined in certain books, the names of which have been advertised six months before the examination. My experience is that they cram those books, which

will be of no use to them afterwards, for five or six hours a day; this combined with the study of the other subjects they have to be examined in utterly breaks down many of them.

2007. What do you propose in lieu of that?—I propose to make the examination which they must pass have a certain *minimum* basis of mathematics, which should be exacted from all alike and then that the examination should principally rest upon a good sound knowledge of mathematics or on a good knowledge of classics, such as a fifth-form boy would have in our large public schools. Since the public schools have taken up the preparation for Woolwich, they have been obliged to fall in with others in cramming, but we get a far better class of young men from the public schools to what we do from other sources.

2008. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) We have had an opinion expressed that the severe examinations now insisted upon for admission to and promotion in the Austrian army have had the effect of very largely excluding the higher classes, who now no longer seek to enter the service; does it strike you that the same causes may lead to similar results in the British army?—No; it does not strike me so. I am not afraid of that, and my reason is that up to this time we certainly have not deteriorated; on the contrary we are getting young men now, the sons of men of property, more than ever we used to do in the artillery and engineers.

2009. But, if increasing the examinations or making them more severe, or anything tending in that direction should have such an effect, you would think it very objectionable?—Yes; but at the same time I think that it would never do to put the examinations down too low, because then you may get in boys out of parochial schools who are exceedingly well prepared now-a-days.

2010. If you go outside a regiment for officers to promote, why do you limit the selection to the district in which they are serving?—I premised my observations by saying that with regard to the infantry, I would make the promotion by districts because the whole number of officers is so very large. I would group a certain number of regiments, and prepare a general list from them, and not from the whole army because it is too large.

2011. (*Chairman.*) You think that the regiment is too small, and you think that the army as a whole is too large?—Yes; taking the infantry it is so, and therefore I would group them into districts.

2012. You think that that would give you a sufficient range for you to equalize the promotion?—Yes; the district system suggested itself to me from military considerations, which are not within the inquiry of the Commission, but I think it would assist very much in carrying out the objects of the Commission in obtaining a regular promotion.

2013. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) If, as you proposed, substantive promotion were given instead of brevet promotion as a reward for distinguished service in the field, do not you think that that would be limiting the power of reward very much?—I think that the power wants to be limited to really distinguished service, and that promotion should not be made so general as it is now by brevet.

2014. You would limit it to a very great extent, because you have to find employment for those substantively promoted men?—Yes.

2015. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) As our army is stationed in various parts of the world, could not the scheme which you propose for promotion be carried out by promotions in India taking place amongst the regiments in India, and promotions in the Mediterranean taking place amongst the regiments on that station, and promotions in Canada and Bermuda and the West Indies amongst the regiments in those countries, and making them districts?—I do not think it would be so good a system. The regiments in India and the regiments in the colonies belonging to the same districts *quoad* promotion with regiments at home, would not I think create any delay in filling up men's places in India and elsewhere. The operation would be facilitated by the ready means of conveyance available now-a-days for sending men out from home.

2016. You stated that the examination for the staff should be on general subjects, but that a special training is necessary for war duties on the staff, do you think that the officers would be likely to obtain that special instruction without going to a military college, or to some establishment where they could receive military instruction?—Certainly, no doubt whatever they could obtain any amount of knowledge they liked without that.

2017. And would they be as likely to obtain it?—If they studied and chose to work at it they could have opportunities anywhere.

2018. I believe there are now, according to the regulations, two captains and three subalterns for two companies. You propose one major, one captain, and three subalterns, thus there would be no reduction in the company officers?—If your statement of the two captains and three subalterns to two companies is correct, that is so, but I do not think it is correct; for instance, this establishment, "B" home battalion, has eight captains and 13 subalterns to eight companies. You cannot say that that is two to two companies, but it is pretty nearly that, you cannot divide them; in that case it would be the same number.

2019. (*Mr. Welby.*) I think you told the Commission that you had endeavoured to make your plan of retirement in the army upon the scale *mutatis mutandis*, which is already sanctioned for the navy?—Yes, to a very great extent.

2020. Only of course the terms of services being different, you are obliged to somewhat modify the number of years' service attained in the army as compared with that attained in the navy at each age?—Yes.

2021. Have you any idea whether in the navy the officers do actually reach the full service line which is set against their name?—I believe they do.

2022. The reason I asked that is that I notice that in the army in most cases the amount reached would exceed considerably the amount which you have set against an officer's name. You give 425*l.* to an officer at 49, supposing he has 26 years' service. An officer at 49 would usually have something like 31 years' service, and I presume that at 49 an officer would have been on full pay nearly all the time, would he not?—Many of them would have been 30 years, I should think. They enter the army from 17 to 20. I think you might fairly take it at about from 18½ to 19 years as the age at which they will enter for the future.

2023. The basis of your computation was that a naval officer earned more than the large amount which is put against his name, and an army officer would do likewise in most cases?—The number of years' service of officers that I gave was taken from the scale that is employed in the navy. I have adapted the scale of years in the navy, and because a proportion of their time is made up of half-pay service, I considered that they were obliged to adopt a lower scale of years than we can, and I added four years to their scale, which I thought would about put us on a par.

2024. But an army officer would, in all probability, leave something like 455*l.*?—Yes, I should have mentioned, as part of my proposition, that the maximum retirement which I should propose for a colonel would be 600*l.*, exclusive of any pension for wounds he had at the time, a lieutenant-colonel 400*l.*, a major 300*l.*, and a captain 250*l.* I would adopt a maximum for each rank, just as I stated in the beginning, that I would adopt a maximum for the general.

2025. You were asked at the beginning of your evidence, when you were speaking about the navy plan, a question which rather implied that the navy plan has failed; do you know whether the block in promotion has been caused by the fact that only one vacancy in three or four is being filled up, and that any dissatisfaction that exists does not arise from the scale of allowances?—I cannot state what the general

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Linton Simmons, R.E.

22 April 1875.

opinion is, but the few men that I have talked to have all told me that they consider the scale of retiring pensions very liberal, and they have no complaint whatever to make as regards that.

2026. And that plan has acted so well, that between 1870 and the present time the number of active officers in that service, going down to the rank of lieutenant, has fallen from 1,550 to 1,128?—They have been going through a period in which they have had to adapt an entirely different and thoroughly worn out system to what is to be the future, and I do not know whether they have actually come down to the establishment which is fixed or not, I cannot state that of my own knowledge.

2027. They are within about 120 individuals?—Therefore, at present, the navy are still in a transition state. What has been adopted with great satisfaction to the navy is, I think, but a slight modification of what was proposed and discussed some few years ago, with regard to the Ordnance Corps, when there was a Royal Commission appointed to consider the question of promotion in them.

2028. You mentioned that your plan would not be very expensive; that entirely depends, does it not, upon the fact, that the number of active officers would be reduced?—Quite so, upon the fixed establishment for the whole officers of the army.

2029. (*Chairman.*) A reduced establishment from the present one?—Yes, reduced as regards the higher ranks, and altogether very considerably reduced. I think myself, with all due deference, that you will find a great deal of difficulty in establishing any system of pensions without enormous expenditure, unless you look fully in the face the establishments for which you have got to provide in future and reduce the numbers.

2030. (*Mr. Welby.*) In speaking of the lads who pass the competitive examination now who sometimes have not physical frames equal to the work that they would have to do, is not the medical examination sufficient to exclude such persons from the army?—No, I do not think it is; the medical examination is conducted with a great deal of care by a number of officers who conscientiously try to do their best with those boys who come up, but they cannot help making allowance for the condition in which they are from over work, and occasionally they may pass one of them whose work has gone on a little too long; disease develops itself afterwards under observation, and we find out that he is broken down, and is really not fit for the service, and scarcely able to continue his studies in the academy.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Thursday, 29th April 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

General the Right Hon. LORD SANDHURST, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., examined.

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

2031. (*Chairman.*) Your lordship's position at present is that of Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, is it not?—Yes.

2032. I will ask you a question or two, first as to the system of promotion which you think ought to obtain in the army, whether promotion should be as a rule by seniority?—My answer to the first question as to whether promotion should take place by regimental seniority, tempered by selection, or wholly by selection, is that the position contained in that question should be reversed; that it should be by selection, tempered by regimental seniority.

2033. Do I understand that you are speaking of all ranks in the regiment, or only the upper ranks?—I am speaking chiefly of the two ranks to which it has been applied by law, the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major, but I would apply it also with regard to all ranks, as in effect is now done under the orders of the Duke of Cambridge.

2034. Do I understand that in your judgment, speaking of all ranks in a regiment, the most desirable method of promotion is to disregard seniority as the rule, and make it only the exception?—No, I do not wish to disregard seniority as the rule, but I wish that to be respected which guided our counsels in 1871 when the change was instituted that seniority should be one of the grounds of promotion, and not an exclusive one. That was what was recognised I may say unanimously by the committee that sat under Lord Cardwell's presidency, who was then the Secretary of State for War.

2035. The present condition of things is that the Commander-in-Chief has the absolute right, has he not, quite freed and untrammelled by any vested rights or interests to fill up any vacancy how he chooses?—That, I believe, is the present state of things.

2036. Assuming that that right is to be maintained, the question then arises as to the mode of exercising it. Would it be your opinion that in the exercise of that right it was desirable or not to follow regimental seniority, except in special cases?—As I say, regimental seniority should form one of the grounds of promotion; but according to the system which was inaugurated in 1871 I deny the right of any regimental officer to be able to claim promotion in his regiment on a vacancy occurring. In the queries which have been sent to me there is another very important question, and that is whether officers should be introduced from outside of the regiment; as, for instance, from the half-pay list, or from other regiments, points which can hardly be determined solely upon the question of seniority. All the considerations which may rule the mind of the Commander-in-Chief on a particular occasion must of course occasionally force themselves upon him, and therefore I say, with regard to this question of seniority, having reference to the promotion of officers in their regiment, that it should be one of the grounds of promotion, but it should not be an exclusive ground.

2037. Should it be the leading ground in your opinion?—Certainly not, if a man is not completely fit, for other reasons.

2038. Not if he is unfit?—Not if he is a poor creature; because a man may be technically fit, but

may be in our opinion not very likely to make a good commander of troops.

2039. Under the term unfitness I include every disqualification that unfits him for actively and efficiently serving in the posts in question; and, assuming that he is unfit, I take it for granted that no seniority ought to give him any right or any claim, or ought in any way to be considered as a reason for promoting him; but assuming that he is not unfit, then I would be glad to know your opinion as to whether under those circumstances seniority should be the leading qualification for the vacant post?—Yes, I think that of course it ought to carry very great weight.

2040. Should that seniority in your opinion, to whatever extent it may be acted upon, be regimental seniority or seniority in the rank in the army generally?—Those are things which must be determined very much by circumstances. I think that the order in which these questions have been put brings that point out very clearly. It is difficult to give a general answer. I am much against the application of absolute rules in these matters. I would rather leave it all to the administration of the Commander-in-Chief of the day.

2041. I am assuming that the whole matter is in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief, and also assuming that no individual has any rights of any sort, and the question that I wish to put to you is, which in your judgment would be the better way of exercising that discretion which resides in the Commander-in-Chief; whether it would be better as a rule to exercise that discretion where seniority comes into question at all by regimental seniority, or whether it would be better to take the wide range, and deal with the seniority as an army seniority?—The conclusion that we arrived at in 1871 was, generally speaking, that with regard to the two superior ranks the seniority should carry great weight with it, but that there were other considerations which might sometimes interfere with its application. Thus, a man might have considerable standing in his regiment, but he might be a very young officer as compared with the rest of the army. For instance, we sometimes see in a cavalry regiment a man is promoted to be lieutenant-colonel when he has but 15 or 16 years' service. We know that in the cavalry some majors have 27 or 28 years' service. Since this principle has been declared to be the rule of the army, I am aware that some officers feel it as a very great grievance that those young officers have been promoted after 15 or 16 years' service, whereas they have perhaps 28. I have no doubt there are good reasons in the War Office for such promotion, but still these are things which have to be very maturely considered.

2042. Would you allow me to ask you what is your view of the effect of what are called the confidential reports which are made now by the commanding officer of every regiment. Do you think that they give the Commander-in-Chief an efficient means of recognising merit, and of withdrawing a man from promotion when he is incompetent?—My opinion of the confidential reports is that their form has been very carefully framed, and that generally they answer their purpose very well; but there is this point with regard to a confidential report, that the general officers and also the regimental officers often feel a heavy responsibility in puting their names to damaging reports, and the difficulty which I should imagine his Royal Highness has found (and I have certainly in my small experience found it), is that the confidential reports when affecting the grave question of a man's character and fitness for promotion to a higher rank are often not sufficiently full.

2043. Do you think that they might be improved?—I cannot say that they might be improved in the form, but it is what the officers choose to commit themselves to who are charged with the duty of making the report. The form of the report seems to me since it was revised some time ago to be as good as it can be.

2044. Such defects as belong to them arise out of the natural disinclination of a superior officer to report unfavourably?—Yes.

2045. Do you agree with what other gentlemen have told us, that it is desirable that those reports when they are unfavourable, should be made known at the time to the individual?—Yes; I am inclined to think that it is but just to the individual concerned. If it is a report affecting his moral character, it gives him an opportunity of reforming; if it merely shows laziness and inactivity, and so on in a young man, it gives him an opportunity of trying to do better, and if it shows that he is really hopeless of promotion from general incapacity and unfitness, it is a good hint to him to retire.

2046. If a man is passed over in consequence of a report of that character, is it your opinion that he ought to remain in the army or not?—I think he should retire. In the queries which have been sent to me, there is one of which I have made a special note. An officer who is condemned, that is to say, who is considered unfit for promotion and so on in his regiment, would be looked upon either as the victim of injustice, or as the proper butt for ridicule for the officers and men, and therefore he should retire.

2047. As I gather your opinion, it is strongly in favour of taking advantage of the present system of the power of selection; can you assist the Commission by suggesting any system, excepting through those confidential reports, by which the Commander-in-Chief may be able to recognise and push forward meritorious officers?—Generally, the confidential reports should be assisted by information drawn from other sources, whenever it is available. With regard to regimental promotion, I am very much inclined to think that the commanding officer of a regiment should in some way have an initiative recommendation for promotion, as we see in the militia. Since 1871 the militia commanding officers recommend for promotion in the several grades, the officers under their command. If an officer is passed over, besides referring to any report that may be against him, the commanding officer is required to give a very full explanation of the reasons why he proposes to pass over such an officer in his recommendation for promotion. In that manner the Commander-in-Chief very often has an opportunity of getting at the real facts about an officer, which might not transpire in any confidential report which is furnished as a routine affair from year to year. Besides that, it certainly would produce a considerable effect in a regiment, if it were known that the initiative recommendation first came from that quarter. It is an idea which has only occurred to me from seeing, as I consider, the really excellent manner in which the system works in militia regiments. In my subordinate command in Ireland, we have frequently had occasion to call in question the suggestion of a commanding officer, that a junior officer should be promoted over his senior; then an explanation follows. Sometimes the suggestion of a commanding officer has been finally approved by his Royal Highness and the War Office, and at other times it has been disapproved, but on the whole the system has, I think, worked very well. It seems to me that that is a hint as to the direction in which we might move, in carrying out the system in the army at large, so far as the regiment is concerned, but of course all this has to be tried, as it is in the militia in a general way, by those considerations of taking men in from the outside of the regiment, that is, from the half pay list, or from the regiments; that of course would be a thing to be decided by the Commander-in-Chief. Just in the same way, if a commander of a militia regiment, as occasionally happens, reports that his first three or four lieutenants have not passed the necessary examination, or that they have not attended the training, or that there is something against their character in some sort of way, which prevents his recommending them for promotion, he goes outside to an officer of the line, or an officer on the half-pay list, or some officer who has served

Gen. Lord Sandhurst. G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

in the army before, to be appointed to his regiment. Then, again, in the case of any officer whom he may pick out in that way, his antecedents are examined into very carefully, and reported on to the Commander-in-Chief by the general officer under whose charge the negotiation takes place, and finally a decision is come to in the War Office.

2048. Will you be good enough to explain to me a little more precisely, what the system is to which you have been adverting in your last answer. I will point the question in this way; is the system to which you refer, a system under which the commanding officer of a regiment picks out a junior officer in rank, and on account of his special merits, proposes that he should go over the heads of those who are his seniors; or is it a system under which the commanding officer, finding some fault with those who are above him in rank, seeks on that ground not to appoint them, but to appoint him in preference?—As I have seen the system in operation, the commanding officers to whom I refer, and from whom my experience is gathered, have been governed generally by a consideration of what is best for their regiments, that is to say, that the officers senior of the grade, were either incompetent from not having passed the different examinations, or not having complied with the various regulations that are in vogue, or else unfitted in character, or from any other circumstance. Then they either take junior officers, or else ask leave to appoint some officer whom they name perhaps, or if they have not got any, they ask for officers who have been connected with the army.

2049. That system which you have just now described, as I understand it, is this; it is a system under which the commanding officer, feeling that certain officers one after the other who would be senior, and would be next entitled by that seniority to the appointment, are not in all respects fit for it, seeks some one else to take their place?—Yes; that is exactly my notion of selection.

2050. That is to say that selection would be acted upon in this way; that where there was any unfitness in those who are next in seniority, they should be set aside for somebody either in the regiment, or out of it?—Yes.

2051. Supposing that the senior officer is fit, and that there is nothing against him, but that the man immediately below him is a very much better man for some reason or other; would you then put the better man up, and pass over the fit man?—No; not unless there was something very extraordinary indeed.

2052. Some state of circumstances which would be exceptional?—Yes; which would be very exceptional.

2053. You think that that system might be applied to the army as it is applied now to the militia?—I think it might be.

2054. Is not that substantially the same thing as what is done now, inasmuch as the commanding officer of a regiment now has to report upon the qualifications of every officer, and if he finds that there are two or three officers immediately below the grade in which there is a vacancy, for some reason unfit, he is bound to report that to the Commander-in-Chief?—Yes; it seems to me that there is a great deal of difference between the terms in which an annual routine report would be conceived, and which is not intended to produce any immediate effect, and the terms in which a man would state his case, who was asking the Commander-in-Chief to do so strong a thing as to pass over the senior officer of a grade.

2055. The one would be a routine report made annually, without being pointed to any special occasion, and the other would be a special report having reference to particular cases?—Yes, the former is but little open to question, and the latter would be subject to a very serious inquiry on the part of the Commander-in-Chief. A commanding officer taking that step would be subjected to something like a cross-examination and even his motives would be probed and very properly so.

2056. Do not you think that one great difficulty attending those reports by the commanding officers is the danger of favouritism?—That is the danger, and there is also the danger of their being nullities or conveying no real information, which I think will be found to be the experience of the military secretary at the office here. Probably what the War Office has to complain of is that the reports do not convey sufficient information, as I said before.

2057. Would not it be an extraordinary case rather for a commanding officer to make such a report as you are alluding to. Does it often happen, do you think, that he would made such a report?—I do not think he often would in the ordinary routine report.

2058. But on the occasion which you describe, when a vacancy arises, would it often happen?—It would not often happen, because there is such a uniformity of merit amongst the regimental officers with regard to the duties that they have to perform, that it is very difficult to establish any very marked superiority of one over the other, and it is only positive unfitness which would cause a man to be so reported on.

2059. In time of peace, when matters that have to be dealt with are merely what may be called regimental matters, it is very difficult, is it not, to ascertain any special merit in an officer?—It is difficult, but I think we generally know in time of peace in a regiment, and I consider that the commanding officer must be very blind indeed if he is not able to discriminate between the characters of the officers belonging to the regiment; it would be difficult for him, barring exceptional circumstances, to put his finger upon any special thing which would cause him to pass over a man and take that very strong step. In the militia I should mention that cases occur of officers not having completed their training and not having passed their examinations, and all that kind of thing, which in a line regiment you do not see.

2060. Keeping still to the question of merit, and the means of exercising selection, what is your opinion of the present working of the Staff College, is it a satisfactory establishment for the purposes for which it is instituted?—So far as it goes I think the Staff College is a very excellent institution, but I do not think it is nearly comprehensive enough.

2061. By that do you mean that there are not facilities enough, or a sufficient number attending it?—I should prefer to see a lower standard of entrance and a lower standard of final examination, and a larger number of students.

2062. Would you be prepared to accord to the successful students who obtained a certain certificate on passing through the College any preference by way of promotion?—No, certainly not.

2063. But you would probably agree that they should have some preference in the staff appointments?—I have always myself been of opinion that the Staff College should be ruled by the same principles as those which guide a university, that is to say, that the prizes to be won at the Staff College should be gained at the Staff College, that there should be scholarships or prizes of some kind or other which it would be worth while for a man to compete for, and that being done I would leave it then to the officers to assert themselves in the army with regard to obtaining staff appointments. I do not think the career of a staff officer should depend mainly upon successful school acquirements, but I hold a very strong opinion at the same time that our best educated officers are the best officers we have; and I am quite certain that if it were possible to get the facts from our annals, we should find that the men who have done the best in the army or in service before the enemy in most difficult times are those who have been the most highly educated; but it has always been my opinion that generally speaking those men without any official intervention would find their place upon the staff of the army from the mere fact of their qualification.

2064. I understand that you would let the Staff College as an institution begin and end, so to speak, in its own degree?—Yes.

2065. You would not associate with the possession

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

of that degree any necessary preference either of promotion or staff employment?—No.

2066. But you would treat it as a university degree conferring a certain amount of consideration upon those who have obtained it, it being looked upon by those who have to give appointments as a guarantee of a certain proficiency in education?—Yes.

2067. But without carrying any special rights with it, and forming no part of a system of promotion or staff employment?—No. It is to be recollected that the education which an officer gets at the Staff College is an enormous advantage to him in his after life, whatever his career may be, supposing he leaves the army. But whilst I have advanced those opinions, I must say that they are bound up with what I have always maintained, that, to use a phrase of mine which was quoted, the doors of the Staff College should be thrown open a great deal wider, and that instead of its being confined to some 15 or 20 students who pass a very difficult examination, you should have at least 100 men there.

2068. How would you regulate their right to entrance to the Staff College if there were many candidates?—That perhaps would have to be done by competition or by a test examination.

2069. What would you say of the initiative being given by the commanding officer of a regiment recommending the man whom he thought most likely to do credit to the service?—That, I think, would be governed according to the manner in which all those things are done in the army; that is to say, a man would first signify to his commanding officer his wish to go to the Staff College, as I suppose he does now, then the commanding officer would, if the man was a decent fellow, say that there was no objection. That application would then be forwarded in the usual course to the War Office, and he would undergo whatever test was required of him.

2070. Supposing there were two or three such men, and only room for one, how would that be managed?—Then either it must be done by having a list, and taking the first on the list, and the others coming up in their turn afterwards, or else it must be adjusted by competition as it is now.

2071. Or by selection by the commanding officer?—I think I should not be inclined to leave that point to the selection of the commanding officer.

2072. Supposing there was a vacancy in the college, and that three officers were candidates for it, and that the third one, quite independently of mental qualifications, was a man who was likely from his energy and his capacity for field exercise of every sort likely to make a more active and useful officer than the other two, all that the commanding officer would know, would he not?—Perhaps he might. I think that after all the test turns upon intellectual acquirements. I think that the point of going to the college is a thing which should be judged of by examination, rather than by selection by the commanding officer, who might very easily make a mistake about it.

2073. We have been told that in the Prussian War College they insist very closely upon real work on the part of those who enter the college, and that if a young man does not work or progress as he ought to progress they turn him out; it has been suggested to us that in our staff college some men at least go there with the view of escaping the annoyances of regimental service, being glad to be located in one spot for two years, and to escape their duties, rather than for the purpose of improving themselves; do you think that that is so?—I have no personal experience of the Staff College, and I could not possibly give an opinion, but I should think that any instance of that kind ought at once to attract the notice of the commandant, who should recommend such a man's removal.

2074. With respect to staff appointments, would it be your opinion that it is desirable that a man who had been five years in the higher appointments of the staff should be reappointed, or is it more desirable to seek fresh officers from the general ranks of the army?—I think this question should have regard to proved individual merit rather than to the operation of a general rule.

2075. But it would be difficult, would it not, to prove the merit of a man who had never exercised the functions of a staff officer?—If an officer is very efficient indeed in the staff he might be kept there, and his promotion provided for accordingly. On the whole it is very salutary that at the end of five years an officer should return to his regiment. I think a larger field should be opened to the field officers of a regiment, that is to say, to the majors, than is at present the case. I should much like to see those officers more employed upon the staff in turn, they being seconded in their regiments accordingly for the interval of time passed in staff employment.

2076. May I take it as the result of your opinion that, as a rule, you would appoint fresh men, subject where there are exceptions to very special qualifications in particular cases?—Yes.

2077. By the word promotion do you mean advancement departmentally, or promotion in the army?—I mean not advancement departmentally, but army promotion; departmental advancement depends upon the administration.

2078. To pass to another branch of the subject, may I ask you what in your opinion would be the most useful age at which a man should take the command of a regiment?—It is very difficult to answer that question.

2079. I am not asking you to define the age beyond which no man should be allowed to take the command of a regiment; but supposing you were contriving a system of promotion, what is the age at which, speaking generally, you would think it most desirable that the commanding officer of a regiment should attain his position?—In time of peace a man is a very good commanding officer up to 55 years of age. In time of war, if a man has got all his wits about him, and has made use of his first 10 years of army service, he is much better at 28 than he is at 55 for such a purpose. But perhaps I should say that a man is never so fit for the command of a regiment, as far as years are concerned, as between the ages of 35 and 45.

2080. Would you consider the attainment of that as an average age a desirable thing for the efficiency of the army. Is that a thing which has much importance in your eyes?—No, I do not think it is. Men vary so very much that you never can tell. One man is as mature at 30 years as another is at 45.

2081. We have had a good many suggestions on the subject of brevet promotion. The system of brevet promotion is said to produce great anomalies, and I presume that you agree that that is so?—Yes, it produces anomalies certainly.

2082. But, on the other hand, it is said to be the only practicable method at any rate hitherto in use in the army by which meritorious officers may be pushed forward. Is that your opinion?—Of course, if a system of selection were fairly carried out throughout the army at large, such as I glanced at, by bringing officers to a regiment from the outside, it would very often be possible to give them rewards by a substantive promotion in the regiment, which I believe has occasionally been made use of, but of course very sparingly with regard to the claims of the regiments concerned; but, on the whole, I think that brevet promotion, if it is carried on moderately, and not to a very great excess, is a thing which is rather advantageous than not. It is very encouraging to young men in the army, as giving them a chance, and they set great store by it, I think.

2083. Do you agree with some others in thinking that it has been too lavishly bestowed of late years?—I think that the action of public opinion has caused a larger brevet promotion than is altogether good for the interests of the service. In olden days the Duke of Wellington used to accord brevet promotion after campaigns, but it was done on a very limited scale indeed, and of course it was valued accordingly. But now-a-days after a campaign it appears to me that

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

every captain who has been under fire is made a brevet major.

2084. That you think very undesirable ?—I think it very undesirable. I think it produces unfairness towards the officers of the army who have not had a chance of being in the campaign. But after all a great deal of duty in a campaign is of the purest routine kind. A great number of those gentlemen who are so promoted ran perhaps very little risk, and did not undergo more fatigue, and probably not more danger, than we do in an Irish riot; and yet, if we take the case of the Abyssinian war, whilst a man is covered with honours for having advanced with his regiment in Abyssinia, another man who has been marching all over Ireland during the Fenian times, as happened under the command of Lord Strathnairn is never mentioned. Of course it would be very wrong indeed to give brevet promotion to a man for such an affair as marching over Ireland; but still he cannot help seeing that he is doing quite as hard work as his friend, who has become perhaps a lieutenant-colonel.

2085. I suppose that whatever system you adopt, to a certain extent these sort of inequalities must be inevitable ?—Yes, but it ought not to be overdone; just as I think it was too restricted in the old duke's time, according to my recollection of the Indian campaigns of 1845 and 1848, so I think that of late years, since the Crimean war, it has been rather too lavish. I should like to see it a little moderated.

2086. Do you not think that, to some extent at least, it has been in compliance with the demand of public opinion that some reward should be given ?—I think we see considerable agitation in the public prints demanding rewards for this man and for that man, and so on; in fact it has been the fashion of the day, I think. Questions are constantly put in Parliament about it.

2087. Assuming it to exist, the question arises whether any other method of rewarding could be put forward which would be free from some of the objections to brevet. Have you considered whether such a thing might be done ?—There is a means by extending the Bath to captains; or an order of merit, or something of that kind; but that of course does not carry the same effect as brevet promotion, because brevet promotion really, in the after career of a man, makes a great difference to him; not so great as it used to do, because of this very system of selection, but still it does help a man forward very much. In former days, before the system of the army was altered, a man getting a brevet majority early in life became a general officer perhaps 20 years sooner than his comrade who was standing next to him in the regiment.

2088. But that is not so now ?—There are rules which have been made of late years; I cannot specify them, but I think they hedge and guard it now more than formerly.

2089. Another method of reward would be unattached promotion, but that places a man on half pay, does it not ?—Yes; I do not think that that is a good thing. It was found to fail most lamentably, I think, during the Crimean war. According to my recollection, during that struggle the system was first inaugurated of converting brevet rank into substantive rank,—the result being that a young man of 25 or 26, who was in the very flower of youth and vigour, left the army to come home unattached to England at the very time when we wanted him most with that army, and we got an ensign of 17 years in his place.

2090. Meanwhile the officer would remain on half pay, and if he were to be taken from half pay he would *pro tanto* stop promotion in the regiment ?—Yes; he would *pro tanto* stop promotion in the regiment when he was brought back to it.

2091. With regard to the fixed establishment of general officers, have you any decided opinion as to whether any change should be made in that system ?—I have long held opinions of my own upon the subject, but I am afraid they are rather crude. I would have two lists of general officers, an active list and a retired list. For the future the active list should not consist of fixed numbers, but should depend rather on the wants of the establishment. Promotion to the rank of major-general by a selection from the list of colonels being freely exercised by the Commander-in-Chief, no officer should be able to claim promotion or the active list from the rank of colonel as a matter of right, but it should still proceed in favour of the old officers of whatever age on the retired list. An officer on the retired list who had been distinguished on active service, or had had his full share of Indian or other foreign service, should remain eligible for the position of honorary colonel, and such employments as the governorship of Chelsea, the Tower, &c., &c. An officer once placed on the active list may remain there without inconvenience, taking his chance for an honorary colonelcy with a general on the retired list according to the claims of the service, distinction, seniority, &c., &c. Promotion to the higher grades on the active list of colonels should not proceed on a slavish observance of the principle of seniority, but should be regulated rather by selection, in the exercise of which seniority as one claim but not an overwhelming one, would not be overlooked.

2092. Do I understand your proposition to be this, that there shall be a retired list, which retired list shall consist of men who by seniority reach that list, that list being a fixed list in point of numbers, and the vacancies arising from death on that list being filled up from time to time from the senior colonels in the army ?—Yes.

2093. And that the benefits of that retired list should be the regular progression to the higher ranks of major-general and general, coupled with a right if the Commander-in-Chief should please to select them to an honorary colonelcy ?—Yes.

2094. And that besides that retired list there should be a second one to be called the active list ?—Yes.

2095. That the mode of obtaining a place on that active list should be purely selection ?—Yes.

2096. That the Commander-in-Chief should select such colonels from time to time as he thought desirable to take their place on that active list, and that the number of that list should not be a fixed number, but should be a number calculated to meet the requirements of the active service of the army ?—Yes.

2097. That with regard to promotion on that list seniority should not be thrown out of sight; that it should be one thing to be taken into consideration, but it should by no means be the absolutely guiding consideration ?—Yes.

2098. And that on this list, like the other, a general officer should be eligible for an honorary colonelcy if the Commander-in-Chief should select him ?—Yes; I think that a colonel who has passed the age of 60 should not be promoted on the active list, but exceptions might be made in the case of very active and distinguished men. I would abolish temporary and local rank, except perhaps in the case of *quasi* diplomatic appointments such as we see from time to time in missions in India and elsewhere. I incline to think that the rank of brigadier-general should be abolished, and that when the Commander-in-Chief selects a colonel to command a brigade he should be an effective major-general on the active list. A lieutenant-colonel commanding a brigade is at a great disadvantage with regard to his pay considering what is expected from him, his aide-de-camp, &c., &c. At the expiration of the five years' command a major-general should be able to claim promotion to the rank of lieutenant-general and so on to that of general. I would make promotion on the active list contingent on actual employment, that is to say, if an officer had been for five years in command of a brigade or a division with the rank of major-general, he would then claim his rank of lieutenant-general. As to whether he would be appointed to a subsequent command that would rest with the Commander-in-Chief. But just as we see now that lieutenant-colonels become colonels after five years' command of a regiment, so I think it is but fair that when a man has completed his command of five years as a major-

general, he should, supposing the active list were adopted, be able to claim the rank of lieutenant-general on giving up his command. It has occurred to me that there ought to be some slight difference of pay and emoluments between a major-general on the retired list and a general officer who is on the active list. I should say that the pay of a major-general on the active list should be 500*l.* per annum till he obtains a regiment, and a lieutenant-general or a general 600*l.* and the retired pay after a certain prospective date (so as not to interfere with the claims of the present generation) might perhaps be 400*l.* per annum till the regiment is obtained. An officer on the active list whose career is virtually at an end, being desirous of honorary promotion, might be transferable to the retired list, retaining the unattached pay which he draws on the active list.

2099. Would this scheme, as it has passed through your mind, involve any addition to the total number of generals on the fixed establishment?—No, I think not. I think it would probably be about the same, and any little additions that there would be in the emoluments of officers on the active list would be ultimately reimbursed by putting the retired list on a slightly lower scale, because the retired list would be much larger than the active list. At present, in point of fact, we have this strange anomaly in our system that the great list of generals is a retired list practically, and I think that a very great disadvantage. I think there ought to be a very marked line drawn.

2100. Have you formed any idea as to how many the active list might consist of?—It would require a good deal of time to work it out. I have not been able to go into it in detail, but that is a thing which could be easily ascertained, I think.

2101. Is there any age at which you would remove a man from the active list to the retired list?—I would leave him on the list if he chose, having once been there, but he would not be able to claim further promotion.

2102. In your opinion is it an undesirable thing that a man, after commanding a regiment for five years, should go on half pay and remain on half pay for six or eight years, whatever it may be, till his turn comes to become a major-general?—Such a long time as that is undesirable. It does a man much good sometimes being his own master for two or three years, but to be out of harness for a much longer period I think is disadvantageous to him.

2103. Particularly in the present day when great changes are going on?—Yes.

2104. Would it, do you think, be a desirable thing to offer to lieutenant-colonels who have completed their five years' command of a regiment some reasonably liberal pension or retirement in order to relieve, so to speak, the list of generals from the advanced age at which men generally attain to that rank?—That really comes to be a question for the actuaries of the War Office; it comes to be a question of expense.

2105. It would form, no doubt, a considerable item in considering the expense, but would it be a desirable point at which to bring to bear the State purse in order to relieve the generals' list?—It seems to me that it rather depends upon a point to which I do not think we have adverted, and that is, what is your opinion as to the system of compulsory retirement if required for giving a flow of promotion in the army. I am myself very much in favour of a system of compulsory retirement with regard to the respective ages of the officers in the different grades.

2106. Beginning at the lower grades how early in the professional life would you suggest compulsory retirement?—I think a captain who had not been promoted at 45.

2107. Which would be about 25 years' service?—Yes thereabouts. I should be very much inclined to say I am sorry for it, but I think you have reached a time of life when you ought either to be a major or to be no longer on the active cadre of a regiment.

2108. Have you fixed in your mind any idea what retirement it would be right to offer such a person?—I think he ought to have his full pay retirement; he ought to have his 200*l.* a year.

2109. Would you include his allowances as well as his pay?—I think the full pay would be without allowances a sufficient pension after a period of 26 years' service. Then a major should retire at 50. If he was not a lieutenant-colonel by the time he was 50, I should say, the time is come for you to retire, on the same footing, namely, retiring on the full pay of his rank; and if a lieutenant-colonel (and that rule is exacted now) when he attains the age of 60, but I think every military man in this room will agree that a man who has passed the age of 55 and who has been from 25 to 30 years on tropical service, as most of us have who have reached the age of 55, is very seldom fit to perform the active duties of his profession in the field. That is the criterion I would take of their fitness to remain in the rank, viz., their ability to perform active duty in the field. And, therefore, I think that the age of retirement for a lieutenant-colonel should be 55, the age of retirement for a major should be 50, and for a captain 45.

2110. In each case would you give a retirement equal to the full pay of the rank?—Yes, equal to the full pay at which they retire.

2111. And without allowances?—It has never occurred to me to grant allowances, because I do not think it is admitted in the theories of the War Office at all. For instance, I rather think that there is a complete system of full pay retirement for old officers now-a-days. I do not think it includes any allowances; it never crossed my mind at all.

2112. Those are compulsory retirements; would you as a matter purely of promotion, that is with a view of creating the necessary flow of promotion in the army, see any objection to offering voluntary retirements to men short of those periods at sums to be paid by the State, which would be less costly than if they ran out the full period that you have mentioned?—Generally, I have a great objection to any scheme which goes to increase the estimates without positive service done for it with officers who are physically effective from age and so forth.

2113. Let me put it to you in this way: there are only two majors in a regiment, and there are some 10 captains perhaps, and perhaps 10 or 12 subalterns, and it is absolutely impossible, is it not, to give promotion to those 22 men through the two majors?—Yes, then we come to another point again.

2114. It follows necessarily, does it not, from that organisation that out of the 22 men a certain number never can become majors; to make them all majors would require that a major should hold the appointment only for two or three months perhaps?—It depends so very much upon the circumstances of a regiment. In time of war promotion is generally a great deal quicker that is at all convenient.

2115. In time of peace how is it?—In time of peace it does not matter what your system is, you must have slow promotion, you cannot help it.

2116. The word slow is relative; certainly some promotion may be quicker than others according to your system. Perhaps you are not aware that in the Commission, under which we are now sitting, we are asked to ascertain in what method a flow of promotion as rapid as existed under the purchase system can be effected?—There are certain questions here which seems to me to resolve that problem better than any scheme which would give bonuses to officers to retire. I believe that the system of bonuses to officers to retire has acted with great disadvantage to the administration and government of India. It is a system which has been more than once had recourse to, and when the object has been to rid the service of those who have become inefficient from age, or from sickness, or from other causes, it has been seen that some of the ablest officers have gone whom we could very ill spare, because of the advantages suggested by the offer of a bonus, or retiring pension, or what not, believing, possibly, that they could not refuse the offer without injustice to their families. I think the same thing might

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

very often apply to the army. I do not know how it may be in the Royal Artillery, but they have certainly a system of that kind in the Royal Artillery now I think. I am not able to say how it is working there, but it seems to me that such a system as you suggest by which the promotion of the army generally might be accelerated, is open to us by admitting to the line (in which I include the cavalry and infantry), the same privilege which was accorded to the Royal Artillery and the Royal Engineers three years ago, that is to say, that there should be some system of arrangement by which there should be four or five field officers in a regiment of infantry or cavalry, that is to say, a field officer for each two companies of infantry and for each squadron of cavalry, instead of the cadres of the present day.

2117. You would deal with the matter of promotion by altering the organisation?—By altering the cadres so far.

2118. That is limiting the number of captains, and in the same ratio increasing the majors?—Yes, by that means I should get rid of the two majors who ride on the right and on the left of the battalion, but I should have in their place five majors for a battalion of ten companies, and I should only have five captains, that is to say, there would be 10 officers instead of 12, but there would be five majors *plus* five captains.

2119. Instead of ten captains and two majors, it would be five captains and five majors?—Yes.

2120. Reducing, therefore, the number altogether by two, and turning three captains into majors?—Yes, then they would really take rank in the double company, just as the major and the captain now do in the battery of field artillery.

2121. In that way you would facilitate the flow of promotion?—Of course, in that way we gain the point which you say you are instructed to inquire about. With regard to our regimental organisation on the field of battle as necessitated by the introduction of arms of precision, I am quite certain that such a cadre will be found to be of very great practical advantage in the field.

2122. Would you mind explaining how it would act in that way?—It acts in this way, that owing to the introduction of arms of precision officers in command of small bodies of men come to exercise an immensely greater weight in the direction of affairs before an active enemy than was formerly the case. Formerly, when we had nothing but our smooth-bore artillery and our old muskets we could practically only act in masses. Now we reckon that the soldiers act individually. The front of each company is much extended before the enemy and a great deal must be left to the discretion of the officers in command, and it seems to me that by the arrangement which I proposed we should achieve that which has been found to be so extremely advantageous in the organisation of the German army, and which has been copied in the French army, and I believe in other armies of Europe besides.

2123. What is the point gained, you have got fewer officers and you have got majors instead of captains, but how does that affect the fighting capacity of the regiment?—I was asked what was the advantage of changing the regimental organisation, and the point that I am driving at is this, that I want to connect on the field of battle two companies indissolubly, and that there shall generally be an officer of the rank of major to command those two companies, what in the German army is called the double company. The two majors at present existing do very little: they in fact do nothing at all, they are merely to replace the commanding officer if he falls.

2124. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do you mean that there should be no regimental majors under that organisation?—The five officers I allude to would all be majors together.

2125. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I understand that you call them majors, but they would be practically captains?—They would have the command of two companies.

2126. But then the company, looking at it abstractedly, is a bigger unit, and the officer who commands that company, although you call him a major, would be performing the same functions with that larger unit that the captain does now?—But there is a great difference between 200 men and 100.

2127. In active service in the field before the face of an enemy, is not 200 men a large unit for one officer to take the personal direction of?—He would have his second captain under him, and all his lieutenants under him besides. My answer is this, as it appears to me, that that point which is asked for, namely, to secure a greater flow of promotion, may be secured in this manner, and at the same time you have a considerable improvement in the regimental organization for field purposes.

2128. (*Chairman.*) The major, as you contemplate him, would have the same function in relation to the double company as the captain has hitherto had, in relation to a single company?—He would command the double company on the field with some slight alteration of drill, very much as a major does a field battery in the artillery, the captain being second in command to take his place whenever he was out of the way.

2129. Would not that system of organization increase the amount of full pay?—No; I think you would get no increase of pay, because if the two captains disappear, that would account for more than the extra emolument of the extra majors.

2130. Upon that subject, may I ask, do you think that upon the whole there are too many officers now?—No; I do not think there are too many officers. I should like to see more lieutenants. I think that the number of subalterns in a regiment has been unduly diminished; formerly we used to have more.

2131. You have had great experience in India; what do you say is the great requisite in a regiment in India?—In India I very much prefer the old cadre of three subalterns to each company, which was always our allowance when I first went to India; now I think it is only two, and I do not consider that enough; there are such demands from sickness, and the necessity of officers going on leave, and the new demands of education, which alienate officers from the regiment, and so on, that on the whole I think it is a great pity that there is not a larger number of subalterns in India. There is besides the system of the Indian Staff Corps which takes its recruits from the subalterns of H.M.'s regiments serving in India.

2132. Do you think that there are too many captains?—No; I do not think there are now too many captains. If the organization were framed as I should like to see it, then I should be willing to suppress two captains.

2133. If no such change took place, would you say that there were too many captains?—No, I think not.

2134. If, as you say, owing to the new arms of precision, some considerable change may be necessary in the organisation, ought not it rather to be by way of increasing the officers, because I presume the mortality amongst the officers is likely to be very much increased?—That increase should take place amongst the subaltern officers.

2135. It is I suppose likely to be the case in future wars that there will be a larger mortality than there is now?—I should imagine that in any future war, the first step which would be taken by the War Office at the time would be to add a subaltern to each company; our present cadre is quite insufficient for the exigencies of a campaign.

2136. Do you apply that to English regiments as well as to India?—Yes, to all.

2137. For active service it should be increased by one officer at least?—Yes, at least one officer per company. Nobody can tell how rapidly they disappear on active service until he has seen it.

2138. But that increase probably according to your opinion ought to be reserved until the time of active service is impending?—I think it would be unwise to increase the estimates in time of peace, unless it were

absolutely necessary. I am more for keeping them down as much as possible.

2139. If there is an increase in the number of subalterns, of course that would again make the difficulty of getting promotion greater?—Yes; if the increase of the number of subalterns were to be considered merely as a war measure, I think you will find that the war will take very good care of their promotion. In time of peace, at all events in England, I do not think I would add to their number, unless it were on very grave consideration indeed.

2140. With regard to the supersession which has unfortunately taken place in the infantry over the artillery, and the artillery over the infantry, and probably which will take place as long as the organization of the different arms is different, has any scheme occurred to your mind by which that might be avoided?—The question we have been discussing was I think one of the things which first suggested the idea of the double company and squadron being put under a major, so as to restore the balance, that would meet the difficulty exactly.

2141. Does any other mode of meeting the difficulty occur to you?—I do not know of any other mode. There was wholesale brevet I think two years ago, but that did not cover the difficulty.

2142. (*Lord Hampton.*) I understood you to say that in speaking of the reports of commanding officers there was danger in your judgment of the commanding officers' reports conveying no real information; may I ask you to explain that opinion?—It proceeds from the unwillingness of gentlemen to commit themselves prejudicially to the character of other gentlemen with whom they are in intimate relations of friendship.

2143. And with whom they are daily associated?—Yes.

2144. With your great experience in the army, it is your opinion that there is a danger from those feelings of delicacy that those reports might not be so trustworthy as they ought to be with regard to conveying accurate information of the character or conduct of an officer?—I think that "trustworthy" is hardly the right word; they are trustworthy, so far as they go, but they are very apt to be insufficient in the amount of information they convey.

2145. I was very much struck by the opinions which you have expressed to us with regard to the extension of the Staff College, if I understand you rightly, you desire to see that college enlarged to the extent of I think 100 officers, and all the examinations reduced in strictness and severity?—Yes.

2146. Do you give that opinion in connection only with the services of those officers subsequently on the staff as staff officers?—It appears to me that there is no necessity for a staff officer to be compelled to undergo an examination in mathematics, which would qualify him to be as I understand a senior optime at least at Cambridge, and perhaps even to take a higher degree. On the other hand, there are certain military subjects which staff officers should be thoroughly masters of. A staff officer who has passed through the college should not merely be able to make an eye sketch of the country, but he should be a thoroughly good surveyor in a scientific sense. He should be able to give you an opinion upon the geological character of the country as well as of the mere area which he has traversed. But what I think is to be deprecated is that these young men should be compelled to go through a course of hard reading in the higher mathematics, which can be of no sort of avail in their profession afterwards, with very rare exceptions. It takes up a great deal of time, and certainly does not make better staff officers of them.

2147. I think your answer hardly meets the question which I put or intended to put, whether in recommending the extension which you have described you would recommend that extension solely with reference to the services of those officers on the staff, or whether you would have in your mind as a reason the acquiring of additional general professional knowledge?—My notion is that if some such system were pursued as I have ventured to sketch, we should gradually raise the standard of the whole army. I do not care to have a limited number of very highly educated professors in the army; but I should like very much to raise the general standard of education and knowledge throughout the army at large, and I think that that point would be gained by making a much freer use of the Staff College than has hitherto been the case.

2148. (*Chairman.*) And not aiming quite so high?—Not aiming at such high qualification.

2149. (*Lord Hampton.*) If I rightly understand you, you contemplate the acquiring of additional general professional knowledge?—Yes.

2150. You said that you should also recommend that the officers under your enlarged system should be competent to gain scholarships and prizes of different kinds; what advantage would result to the individual officers who should succeed in winning those prizes as a recompense to them for the study which they would have gone through?—My idea is that the staff appointments proper should not be the appanage of men who have merely passed through a good examination at the college. On the other hand, as we know from our experience of universities and colleges of different kinds, there must be something for men to strive for, and to which they can appeal afterwards as a practical proof that they have succeeded better than their fellows. It seems to me that some system of scholarships and prizes, as we see in universities, might be very easily organised with but a slight expense, and that those would constitute the proper things for the men to strive to have; and I would leave it to other considerations as to whether they were able to assert themselves afterwards for advancement in the service and the staff employment.

2151. It is your opinion that the honour of having gained those scholarships or prizes would be a sufficient inducement to young men to study for them?—I think so, because there is sufficient hope in every man's breast that if he proves himself a good man his merits will become known, and that he will get the advantage of it.

2152. (*Chairman.*) You have used the expression scholarships once or twice. A scholarship at the universities gets a payment along with it; do you mean a scholarship in that sense?—Yes.

2153. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do I understand you to desire that the officers who succeed in gaining those scholarships should also have some annual increase of pay, which I presume you would recommend for a limited time?—Yes, for a limited time.

2154. Do you think that the result upon the officers would be very much that which of course is a stimulus at the universities, to be able to say he has got a first-class degree?—I think so. In the completion of the system which I have sketched, I think that young men should be encouraged to go to the Staff College, and that there should be probably some limit of age, that is to say, that men of 35 or 36 should not be encouraged to go, but that they should be lieutenants of the army, or the very young captains.

2155. You would put a limit of age to the man rather than a limit of rank?—Yes, rather than a limit of rank, because one man may attain his rank earlier than another. For instance, there is the famous case of Sir Charles Napier, who went to the college, which was in existence before Sandhurst, after he returned from the Peninsular war.

2156. The opinions which you have expressed lead me to ask you the same question which I have put to some other witnesses who have come before us, which is this, whether you would carry those opinions to the extent of recommending rather a more extensive college than you have described, with a view to enable young men who do not at all contemplate staff appointments, but who would be so disposed to study their profession and to acquire increased professional knowledge somewhat on the same principle as in the

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

arrangements of the Naval College?—My view of this is that the whole of Sandhurst should be devoted to the purpose of the Staff College; that no man should go to Sandhurst except as a voluntary student; and that he should go there after he had been a commissioned officer for a certain number of years, say four years, or whatever the rule may be, and it appears to me unwise and inexpedient that young men of 17 or 18, who now pass severe tests in their competitive examination, should be sent to Sandhurst whether as cadets, or whether as sub-lieutenants, instead of letting them join their regiments from their schools, as we used to do in my time. In that manner you would at once get rid of all the difficulty of keeping people in order. The young men who go to the Staff College go there as voluntary students, and if there were the slightest notion of misbehaviour or insubordination, or any misconduct whatever, they would be got rid of without remorse. The mere notion of it would be ruin to them, they being commissioned officers of a certain standing; whereas all the difficulty which has arisen at Sandhurst in the management of the young officers is the false position in which they were placed. On the other hand, it is a great advantage to a young man of 17 or 18 that he should join his regiment at that time, and get the habits of military discipline in his regiment, and it is only in his regiment that he can possibly acquire them, instead of going to the college, as they do now, where they only help one another to get into mischief.

2157. I think I collect from your last answer that you think it would be a good system to have an enlarged college?—Yes, an enlarged college for the Staff College.

2158. I presume you would drop the term staff college and substitute the term military or army college, as they do in Prussia?—Yes, I think so. I think that would be a great improvement.

2159. You said that excepting in certain cases, as a general rule, you thought that an officer employed on the staff should return to his regiment after five years?—Yes.

2160. How would you deal with the position of that officer after that length of time. I think you said that you thought that he should be seconded, and that his place in the regiment should be filled up?—Yes, for five years.

2161. How would you replace him in the regiment?—He would have to wait till a vacancy occurred, as we see now. He would be a supernumerary on full pay till a vacancy occurred.

2162. You would not put him on half pay?—No. I would explain that the regiment would lose nothing in promotion by that, because they would have anticipated the promotion by his being seconded.

2163. You expressed an opinion with regard to those officers who did not return to their regiments after five years, but who continued to serve on the staff. I understood you to say that they might continue to serve on the staff, and then their promotion might be provided for accordingly. I do not quite understand what you contemplate there in the way of promotion?—I have not thought out the details, but that would be a fair case for unattached promotion.

2164. With regard to the question of brevet, I think I understand you on the whole not very much to object to the present system?—I do not object to it much; in fact I do not think I object to it at all, if it is only kept within due limits.

2165. Do you think that it has not been kept within due limits?—I incline to think that brevet promotion compared with the experience of my younger days has been rather excessive in modern times.

2166. And therefore you would retain the system, but check the application of it?—Yes, I would check the application of it.

2167. You do not then, I presume, agree with the witnesses who have been before us, speaking of the system of other countries, who have said that if brevet was done away with the compensation must be found either by an increase of pay or by a personal decoration?—I think it would be a very good thing if we had some means of conferring some order of merit upon captains and lieutenants. I think that would be advantageous, but I have never considered the subject much. I do not think that they would look upon any decoration of that kind as of anything like the same importance as brevet rank.

2168. Not as an equivalent?—No, I should think not.

2169. Nor money remuneration?—I am always disinclined to money compensations.

2170. Does it strike your mind, now that the subject is brought before you, whether it might not be possible to continue such a system as that, without doing away with brevet, and to make it somewhat more rare, and also decorations in other cases?—Yes, it might be done I should think.

2171. I think I understand you to say with regard to the active list of generals that you would have them entirely by selection?—Yes.

2172. And did I understand you to go to the extent of recommending that the Commander-in-Chief should have the power of promoting a colonel to be a major-general irrespective of seniority?—Certainly.

2173. Passing over in fact the heads of the colonel above him?—Yes, and that is quite in accordance with the warrant of 1854; that was the idea which ruled Lord Hardinge's mind when he introduced that reform. In those days when that warrant was introduced, it was not necessary for a lieutenant-colonel to serve five years. It was only necessary for him to serve three years before promotion to the rank of colonel; and I venture to think that that change was very much to the disadvantage of Her Majesty's service. I mean the change of three years to five years, Lord Hardinge's argument being that in time of war the Government and military authorities who advised the Government should have the power to lay their hands upon the best man they could find, and that his youth was no disadvantage to him. On the contrary, provided that he had the other qualities belonging to the exercise of command the service would gain very much by the fact of his being of middle age, instead of advanced age, and so on. That was what the Government and Lord Hardinge meant when he introduced that reform.

2174. I think you desire to have the active list of generals limited in number, do you not?—I prefer to have it just according to the wants of the establishment.

2175. Do I understand you by that to mean that you would not have more generals on the active list than there are actual appointments to fill?—There would be always a certain number of men on the active list who had completed their appointments, but with such exception I should like the list to be really an active list and not to include people whom you could not employ.

2176. And in the filling up of that list, I understand you to express a decided opinion that you would discard the principle of seniority altogether?—Entirely.

2177. And in your view it would become the duty of the Commander-in-Chief in every case of a vacancy to select that man whom he might at the moment consider to be the most deserving colonel?—Yes.

2178. Did I understand you to convey the opinion that by adopting that system the discarding of seniority would be deprived of its invidious character?—I think so. I do not think that there would be anything invidious in it. It is in point of fact what exists now, and the only check upon the Duke of Cambridge at present is the rule which as a man who wants to act with fairness, his Royal Highness evidently prescribes to himself. In selecting colonels to be posted with the rank of brigadier general to command brigades, he evidently gives the question of seniority in these times of peace fair consideration,

That is exactly what I think you would expect from the fair mind of his Royal Highness.

2179. (*Chairman.*) When you say that you would discard seniority altogether, I do not understand you to mean that in exercising the power of selection caprice should affect that seniority?—No, to put the caprice on one side, I am imagining a perfect system.

2180. (*Lord Hampton.*) With regard to what you stated as to altering the organization of our army, you spoke only of the battalion; but I presume, judging from what you have told us, that you would desire to apply the same system to cavalry regiments?—Yes.

2181. You would have the squadron to be the unit instead of the troop?—Yes.

2182. You no doubt are aware that that change was commenced in our cavalry a few years ago?—I think there was some reform contemplated, but I think it fell through.

2183. After a short time that system was reversed. Are you aware of the reasons on which it was reversed?—No, I am not.

2184. The only reasons that I have ever heard of for reversing that arrangement were two; one that it was very much disliked by those who would become junior captains, and the other that it was hardly consistent with the system of spreading our cavalry regiments about the country in small detachments; would you hold either of those reasons especially with your recommendation of a major to command each unit to be sufficient for abandoning that system?—I think not. In the first place, I do not think that any question of the popularity of a system amongst the officers should weigh with us, provided we do not interfere with their just position and claims, that under which we may say they contracted. But if such a system were introduced as that which I contemplate they would all be very great gainers. They would have much larger chances of promotion to the higher ranks than they had before, so that any possible prejudice to them would be done away with. Then with respect to spreading them out in detachments, it would be in precisely the same form as it is now. If it were necessary to break up a squadron, one troop would go to one place and the other troop would go to the other, and the major would be in command of the one troop and the captain would be in command of the other troop, just as we see now when a captain goes and holds completely independent command away from the head quarters of his regiment.

2185. As I understand you, you do not consider that the division of the squadron, which it would be, then, would be any argument at all against the system?—No, it would not affect it in the least.

2186. There would be no more objection to sending half the troop to any particular quarter in that case than there is to sending the whole troop now?—Not the least.

2187. Are you aware that at the time when that alteration of the troop to the squadron was made in our service a reduction was made in the number of officers, that instead of six it was reduced to five for the squadron?—No; I was in India at the time, and I did not follow the changes, as it did not come out to us at all.

2188. Probably you are not aware that although the organization was reversed and the authorities reverted to the troops, they never restored that officer?—They did not.

2189. That I presume you do not approve of?—No.

2190. I think you said that you would have no field officer of a regiment of the line or battalion of cavalry in the rank of major separate from a troop or squadron except the lieutenant-colonel?—Except the lieutenant-colonel. There would be a major to each two companies or squadron.

2191. You think that one field officer disconnected from the troop or squadron would be sufficient?—I think so.

2192. Did I rightly understand you to say that the result of such an organization would be to reduce the number of officers?—It occurred to me that taking a battalion of the line of 10 companies we might have five majors and five captains, instead of having as at present two majors and 10 captains. By that means I should give substantive duties to the two majors whom I get rid of, and who do nothing, and I promote three captains to be majors, and I retain five captains only; so that I really do get rid of two officers, and I should like to see them replaced by two lieutenants; but perhaps there might be reasons against that in time of peace and with small regiments, but that is what I should arrive at. I should have 10 officers of the rank of major and captain, instead of 12.

Gen. Lord Sandhurst G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 187[illegible]

2193. I understand you also to think that that increase in the number of majors would compensate for the loss which you would incur of one field officer unconnected with the regiment, because practically you would have only one field officer?—There would be five field officers instead of two, because they would all be mounted men.

2194. You mean that they would be all available for the duties of field officers?—Yes, they would be all available for the duties of field officers, and it is particularly necessary to note that they would all be mounted.

2195. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In ordinary circumstances we are told that now, under the new system of warfare with arms of precision, that mounted regimental officers would be an impossibility, is that your opinion?—No, I do not think so. They have a great many duties to perform which must be done on horseback.

2196. But we are told that in action such would be the conditions of warfare that mounted officers would be knocked over at once at 600 or 700 yards?—That would all depend very much upon the ground.

2197. You do not hold to that military opinion that mounted regimental officers must be dispensed with?—No, they must always have their horses at hand.

2198. I did not quite understand what you proposed to do with the officers on the active list, in the case of general officers who became inactive after a certain period; would you transfer them to the retired list, or what?—I think I said that I did not see any inconvenience in that particular class of officers remaining nominally upon the active list, but that they would receive no further promotion.

2199. Would not in that case the active list get almost into the same state in time of peace as the whole list does now; a sort of list of active and inactive officers?—There would not be very many of them.

2200. If an officer lives to a mature age he naturally becomes unfit for active service, and after 65 or 70 years of age, under ordinary circumstances, probably he would not be available for service?—No; it is a very small point. It would really be a question of allowances. If the officers on the retired list had smaller emoluments than the officers on the active list, a man might perhaps think it rather hard upon him if he was to go down.

2201. It all rather comes to that question of emolument, does it not?—Yes.

2202. (*Chairman.*) It would be difficult, would it not, to work out the active list on that footing, because when it was first started one can understand the number of appointments being made correspondent to the limit which would be required; but those men must necessarily get old and get past service, so that the number on the active list would either be very much increased, or, if the number were retained the same no room would be left for the younger officers to come up who were capable of command?—On the other hand those men would be coming on to the position of honorary colonel, which would equalise the whole thing again. The position of honorary colonel would give them a salary of 1,000*l.* a year.

2203. But they would still remain on the list, would they not?—Yes, on either list. However, so far as

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

I am concerned, I should not have the slightest objection.

2204. It seems to me that such a system once started and in operation for 20 years would inevitably result in the list growing in number, because the older men would still remain in it?—Yes. A better plan would be, in the case of an officer whom you determined not to employ again, to put him on the retired list, but on the understanding that he was to draw the pay of the active list.

2205. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You would tell off a number from the active list on to the retired list?—Yes, without decreasing their emoluments.

2206. Does not it strike you that it must be necessary to do something of that kind?—Yes, I think that would be considered right.

2207. (*Lord Hampton.*) With your experience of the army do you approve of our system of honorary colonelcies?—Yes, I think I do. I think that the regiments like it, and certainly the general officers like it very much.

2208. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I understood you to say that in selecting officers for regimental promotion you looked more to merit than to seniority as the rule that should guide the Commander-in-Chief; that seniority should be one element, but that after all the other qualities of the officer should be the main element to be considered. That not seniority tempered by selection, but selection tempered by seniority, was your view of the principle of promotion?—Yes.

2209. Do you think that in time of peace there are elements enough to determine what an officer's character is, as such, to overrule the preponderance in favour of seniority?—I think I said before that there was a great uniformity amongst the officers, and that there are extremely few of them indeed who are not fit for promotion for regimental reasons, at all events up to the rank of captain.

2210. Had you command of a regiment yourself?—Yes, for many years.

2211. Was it a line regiment?—Yes.

2212. From your experience of the officers who were under your command, should you have been able in ordinary circumstances to have picked out the man that you would particularly wish to promote?—I commanded a regiment under the old *régime*, under which it did not matter how incompetent or how incapable an officer was (he might have been a madman, or he might have been an idiot), you were not allowed to get rid of him.

2213. That is exclusion rather than selection?—But he was promoted also under the same circumstances; nothing could stop that man's promotion if he remained in the regiment, and practically his promotion never was interfered with.

2214. There were instances, were there not, even under the old system, of officers not being allowed to go up in their step because they were notoriously unfit?—I cannot call an instance to mind in all my recollection. I can only say this, that for two or three years when I was a lieutenant-colonel I had two men in my regiment who were lieutenants; one was a madman and another was an idiot, and every six months I reported those men in those terms, or words to that effect, I illustrated it as strongly as I can by saying, "I dare not give those men charge of a picket, I am "obliged to throw their duty upon others, because "the responsibility would fall upon me if the troops "came to grief." I was on the north-west frontier at the time, nevertheless those men were never removed, and nothing could have prevented their promotion if they had lived. Now, on the contrary, owing to the very happy reforms which have been made of late years, those cases cannot occur. In the first place, such men cannot get into the army, and if they were there we should certainly get rid of them, and still more certainly they never would be able to obtain promotion.

2215. That is to say, that a man obviously and notoriously incompetent would be excluded on account of the reports of the commanding officer?—Yes, only he would not be able to enter the army to begin with. The great advantage of the test examination, which was the first reform by which we began some years ago, was, that it shut out those thoroughly incompetent men from the army altogether.

2216. That must have been a very great gain; but I am thinking now of promotion in the regiment; now such an officer, supposing he could get in by chance, or become a madman after he got his commission, naturally would not get his promotion; but then do you think it advisable that such men should be allowed to remain in the regiment?—Certainly not. I said in a former answer, that if a man is declared to be absolutely unfit for promotion, and passed over accordingly, that man should be required to leave.

2217. Do not you think that a man who is passed over under the present system is pronounced thereby unfit for the step and ought to go?—Yes, he ought to go at once.

2218. And that the authorities should inform him that his services could be dispensed with?—Yes, and that is what I understand to be the system inaugurated by the Duke of Cambridge, according to the experience of what is going on at present.

2219. With the general uniformity of capacity and character which prevails amongst the great bulk of officers (leaving out of consideration very exceptional cases of eminent ability and skill), could you undertake to say that there is so little difference between officers, so far as they can be judged, that in times of peace you would not promote the officers in the regiment except by seniority?—Generally that would be the case.

2220. Then seniority practically, as I understand, even upon your scheme, would prevail in time of peace?—Yes, certainly in time of peace.

2221. Then it comes almost more to a difference of form of expression than anything else?—No, because there is this great difference, that it is in the power of the Commander-in-Chief to introduce men from the outside. It is in his power to promote A B from one regiment into a second regiment, and he can do that in every rank.

2222. You think that even if that power is dormant it operates beneficially in a regiment, as a stimulus to officers to exert themselves?—Yes, I think it a very great power, and I think it is one which should be very frequently put into use. I believe nothing to be so good for a regiment as occasionally to have new blood thrown into it.

2223. And it would be popular with the officers of the regiment themselves?—It might, but whether it were or not it would be a very good thing for the regiment, and often a good thing for the body of officers.

2224. I suppose with the professional feeling which exists, and the regimental feeling in the mess, it would be considered more or less a slur upon an officer who was superseded?—No, I think not; it is a thing which they are all accustomed to see.

2225. Are you in favour of what is generally called the regimental system, that a regiment should be kept together as much as possible, the promotion go in it, and that the officers should live together as a sort of family?—Yes, certainly.

2226. That has hitherto been one essential part of the principle of the British army, has it not?—Yes, but it has been a good deal shaken of late years. The regimental system is not at all what it was some years ago.

2227. It has been modified to suit modern requirements?—There has been a great deal of talk about the regimental system, but I do not know anything which seems to me to have undergone more change than the regimental system of late years.

2228. Is there not in many regiments a sort of traditional spirit and character which has been maintained almost for generations?—Yes, I think there is.

2229. And that in many cases conduces really to the good conduct and high character of the gentlemen connected with the regiment?—Yes, I think it is all very useful.

2230. (*Major.-Gen. Johnson.*) Your lordship is

aware that since purchase has been abolished, and the system of selection has been committed to the Commander-in-Chief, there are now two descriptions of confidential reports, one a report for the information of the Commander-in-Chief as to the state of the regiment generally, and another a specific report for the purpose of guiding him in selection for promotion ?—I am only aware of one set of confidential reports, those furnished every July.

2231. One goes to the adjutant general, and another to the military secretary. The one that comes to the military secretary for the Commander-in-Chief's guidance is purely for the question of promotion on the officer's desert, and fitness or claim for promotion, but that is very different from the old, and what you perhaps justly called routine reports, which were made periodically for the generals of inspection ?—Yes, but this comes to be a routine report when it is given year after year by the same officer. The same officer writes those things, and without reflecting on him in the least it is quite impossible that it should not come to be a matter of routine in his mind year after year ; but we cannot help that, it is incidental to human nature ; not that I would say anything against the form of the report. I think the form of the report is as good as anything can be.

2232. You could not improve upon it ?—I could not improve upon it; I have studied it very carefully, I have looked over a great many of them, and I do not see that any detail has been omitted from the report.

2233. Then practically it ought to be a guide to the Commander-in-Chief in determining whether an officer is fit or otherwise for promotion ?—It ought to be ; but still there is not merely the question of promotion. There is the question of rejection. The detail of facts, the knowledge of training, the knowledge of drill, and so on, is very easily stated ; but as regards the character of a man, whether he is thoroughly to be depended on under this and that circumstance, and so on, these are things which it is difficult to obtain.

2234. But it is quite competent for the general officer to require the lieutenant-colonel commanding a regiment to complete that report in every respect, so that it would enable the Commander-in-Chief to form an opinion of the fitness or otherwise of an individual officer ?—I am quite certain that his Royal Highness would agree with me that that is the difficult point with those reports, at least I know that I have had in my capacity to call attention to many of them in that respect.

2235. (*Chairman.*) Have you seen a great number of those reports ?—Yes, a good many of them. All those from the regiments in Ireland pass through my hands.

2236. Under the column in the report, " Reasons " for considering an officer fit for his position or for " advancement, opinion as to his general abilities," and so on, there is obviously scope for writing a good deal, are they generally fully filled up, or is it generally some such phrase as this, " He performs his duties satisfactorily ? "—That is very often the phrase.

2237. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Then it is not the fault of the report, it is the fault of human nature ?—Yes, the fault of human nature, that is what it is, and therefore it is, that if any system of promotion such as I have sketched out of a commanding officer taking the initiative of recommendation, as we see done in the militia in our days, were adopted, there are causes of inquiry which you cannot get from any mere report of that kind.

2238. You said just now that you would only promote a general officer when it was necessary to employ him in a certain command for which that rank was desired, that is to say, on the active list, and that you would promote a major-general to be a lieutenant-general when you desired his services in a lieutenant-general's command ?—I also said that according to the view that I take, after having completed five years of effective service in a given command he should be able to claim the next grade of rank just as a lieutenant-colonel claims the next grade of rank, which is the command of a regiment.

2239. You are aware from your own experience that under the present system a lieutenant-general is taken quite irrespective of seniority or anything else and put into a full general's command ?—I believe that the only grade for which selection is practised absolutely is in the selection of officers to hold a general's command.

2240. Do you mean a lieutenant-general's command ?—No ; I mean any general's command The Duke of Cambridge takes any colonel he likes, and makes him a brigadier-general, and any general officer he likes, and he can give him local rank or do anything he pleases.

2241. Take your own instance, I think you were major-general when you were selected for the command of the army in Bombay, and then lieutenant-general, full as well as local ?—Yes.

2242. From that you were transferred to a higher command, of Commander-in-Chief in India, and you had the rank of general conferred upon you ?—Yes.

2243. That is a very valuable power, is it not, which the Commander-in-Chief possesses and practically exercises ?—It is very much the same thing, only that I think it is rather a roundabout way of doing things. It seems to me that it would be better that when an officer is taken in that way that he should be at once invested with real rank instead of as it is called temporary rank.

2244. You have had very large experience in India in different positions, as chief of the staff, and as Commander-in-Chief first of one presidency and then of the army in general ; did you find any practical difficulty in the selection or appointment of staff officers in India ?—I never found any difficulty in the selection either of staff officers or of regimental officers, and I carried out all appointments of the Bengal army on the principle of selection for five years.

2245. What I was referring to was this. I gathered from your evidence that you did not think it at all necessary, or even perhaps desirable, that the Commander-in-Chief of the British army should be limited for a selection of officers to the staff to those who have gone through the Staff College ?—Certainly not.

2246. And that in India where there was no such thing in existence as a staff college, the officers of the Indian army who had no means or the power of passing through the Staff College were not deficient as staff officers ?—No, certainly not.

2247. You mentioned just now in answer to the Chairman that you would apply to the line the system of retirement amongst the lower ranks which exists in the artillery ?—No, I do not think I said so.

2248. I understood you so, and I want to bring to your lordship's recollection that there is no retirement in the artillery under 25 years' service which gives them the right to half pay ?—What I was trying to illustrate was that by inducing an officer to retire by an offer of a bonus or an additional pension, and so on, the state was very likely, not only to lose those that the state wished to get rid of, but, as we have seen very often in India, to lose some of its most valuable servants ; then I alluded to the artillery, and said I believed that they had some system of retirement amongst the officers of the artillery, but I could not tell whether the artillery regiment was affected in the same way as I believe the government of India to be affected, that is, whether or not good officers would be induced to retire by the offer of a bonus, or whether they would remain.

2249. (*Maj-Gen. Herbert.*) You have stated that more majors should be employed on the staff. I presume you allude to the employment of those officers as brigade-majors or deputy assistant adjutant-generals or quarter-master-generals ; is it not apparent that for such an appointment the number of lieutenant-colonels must be proportionately reduced ?—I can only illustrate it in this way. I recently lost my military secretary because he was promoted to the substantive rank of major. As long as he was brevet-major he was allowed to be my assistant military secretary, but his promotion was positively the greatest injury that

Gen, Lord Sandhurst. G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

9 April 1875.

could have accrued to him, and that seemed to me to a very great pity. It is not often that a man has a chance of staff appointment, and why of all people in the world those majors who are in the prime of life, when we can get most out of them, should be absolutely shut out by their regimental position from staff employment, I cannot conceive. At this very instant there is a young friend of mine who is a most useful man in Aldershot camp; he is deputy assistant adjutant-general of the Aldershot division; he has been there for the last 2½ years, and he has just been promoted to a substantive majority in his regiment through the death of an officer, and this gentleman now must forfeit his opportunity of future promotion by going upon half pay to retain his staff appointment, or he must throw up his staff appointment, which he discharges I am told remarkably well, he having passed through the Staff College, and gone through the whole business; but he must throw it all up, clearly to the disadvantage of the public service, and go and join his regiment. I think that is a mistake.

2250. This would be remedied, would it not, if all staff officers were seconded?—That is my view. I think, in cases of that kind, that such officers should be allowed to hold such situations as are allotted to their class and rank, and then, in order that their being in the regiment should be no detriment to their holding staff appointments, they should be seconded according to the manner with which we are familiar.

2251. You have informed the Commission that sometimes the confidential reports are not filled up in a sufficiently explicit manner; would not the commanding general officers be even more reticent than at present if they knew that their opinions must be made known to the individuals reported on?—I do not know how that might be, but I think there is such an advantage in every man who has accusations brought against him and reflections passed upon him, more especially as regards his moral character, being informed of the circumstance, that I think it is only just to a man in that position that he should know what is said about him. I think that is infinitely of more importance to the honour and integrity of the service than even the knowledge that may be available by the superior authority in selecting for promotion.

2252. You do not consider that it is advantageous to render the selection of an officer for the staff obligatory on his going through the Staff College, but as I presume, special training is necessary for the whole duties of the staff, and it is the object of the Staff College to supply this training; would not a man who had gone through the college be more likely to make a good staff officer than one who had not had the same advantage?—I can only say just as General Johnson said just now, that according to our experience we have never felt any practical deficiency in the staff officers that we have had to employ in war, since I have had any experience of the British army because they have not passed through the Staff College. But then it is to be understood that nine out of ten and probably a larger proportion of those men had gone through some very considerable professional education before. For instance, we know that in the artillery and engineers their education has always been very special indeed, and during the last 30 or 40 years the entire staff in India, you may say, was furnished by a few officers from those two arms, and by officers who have been educated either at Addiscombe or at Sandhurst. You may take it almost for granted that in the armies that have been put in the field whether in Europe or the Cape of Good Hope or New Zealand, or India, the officers employed on the staff passed through the colleges either of Sandhurst or at Addiscombe, and that there they sufficiently prepared themselves as very young men indeed for the professional duties that they were called upon to perform afterwards. But there is more to be said about it, whether it is staff employment or whether it is regimental command. There is more in the character of a man than mere acquirement that can come to him from passing a successful examination at a college. I am not at all undervaluing what is gained in a staff college. I have already given my opinion, and I hold it very strongly, that the best educated officers are the best officers we have, but at the same time, there is much to be said for moral characteristics as well, and unless there is some strength of that sort to help you, you would get on but poorly with your staff officers.

2253. If all the staff officers that were employed away from their regiments were seconded, does your Lordship consider that there would be any necessity for an increase of officers?—That would depend so very much upon circumstances, and also upon the number of men who were away. At present it sometimes happens in a regiment, as I am told, that besides two or three officers who are on the staff, who are away, they have three or four lieutenants who are away at instruction of different kinds, and the commanding officers do make complaints, but it is very difficult to answer that kind of question, unless one is in the position of the adjutant-general in this office.

2254. As Commander-in-Chief in India, I presume that you are aware that colonels exchanged regiments in India in order to obtain the command of brigades which was usually given by seniority, do you consider this system likely to produce efficient commanders of brigades?—I believe when I was in India that I reported against that system. I am not quite sure, but I rather think I suggested that the Duke of Cambridge should select officers to command those brigades and send them out, just as I used to select officers myself from the Indian service, without thinking too much of seniority.

2255. Is your Lordship aware that officers under the present system, who have been selected to command brigades and who have served with distinction in that rank have reverted to their command of regiments and on some occasions when the rank was full they have been detained in their command for 15 years afterwards?—No, I am not.

2256. Are you in favour of the present system of linked battalions and the officers being interchangable?—Unless you know how the promotion is to be managed, it is impossible to give an opinion.

2257. (*Chairman.*) Supposing that it is like a double battalion regiment, do you think that the system of linked battalions would be a desirable one?—I have not formed any opinion upon that subject.

2258. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Under the system that you propose for the field, would not four field officers be sufficient to take command of the double companies; taking into consideration the other four companies as the war cadre, would not a captain and two subalterns be sufficient to take charge of the depôt?—I should think it would be better to adhere to the major for every two companies.

2259. Would you see any objection to the adjutant being a captain, into consideration the responsible duties that he has to perform?—I do not know whether there is any advantage in that; I rather think it might be advantageous with regard to the efficiency which an adjutant obtains from the mere fact of being an adjutant. It qualifies him for the position of adjutant-general, probably more than going through the Staff College. I should think it would be very advantageous to the battalion at large if the adjutancy of the regiment, instead of being a permanent appointment, which is held very often for 10 or 12 years, were to be held for five years, like other staff appointments, so that the different officers in the regiment might have a chance of holding it.

2260. (*Mr. Welby.*) The substitution of five majors and five captains that you suggest, instead of two majors and ten captains, I think I understood you to say would make hardly any change in the expense?—I guarded myself by saying I had no time to investigate these details, and that I could give no exact answer to the question.

2261. But I understood your Lordship to recommend this change of organisation, not with the view of diminishing the effect of compulsory retirement which you advocate, but as a beneficial organisation for the

army ?—To conduce to two objects, the one being the facilitation of promotion as suggested to me by Lord Penzance, and the other what I think would be a superior organisation for the field with the arms which are now in the hands of the men.

2262. But it would have a tendency to diminish the number of captains retired on reaching the limit of age which you have mentioned, namely 45 ?—Certainly.

2263. And therefore would reduce the dead charge of the army in that respect ?—I think so.

2264. But on the other hand, it would have a tendency to increase the dead charge of the army by making the number of majors that would have to retire upon reaching the age of 50 years ?—Yes, it might have that effect.

2265. Therefore the financial effect of it would be probably an increased charge, inasmuch as the officers would retire when they became majors rather than as captains, and a slight increase in the charge for the increased number of subalterns ?—Yes, I suppose an actuary would tell you a man at 50 has less chance of life than a man of 45.

2266. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) You said that in your opinion the number of subalterns are too few in regiments serving in India ?—Yes.

2267. Are you aware that in 1845 the cadre of a regiment of cavalry was composed of two lieutenant-colonels, two majors and eight captains ?—Yes.

2268. And are you aware that the 3rd Light Dragoons and the 16th Lancers were commanded even with that cadre at the two important actions of Ferozeshah and Aliwal by majors ?—I rather think that what you refer to must have been caused by the lieutenants-colonels being both brigadier-generals.

2269. Would not that take place now ?—No, not now, because I believe now the rule is that they are removed from the regiment.

2270. But they were only appointed as brigadiers, because the force was formed on the spot on the spur of the moment. Do you consider the cadre of a regiment of cavalry sufficient composed as it is of one lieutenant-colonel, one major, and six captains ?—My proposal would be that there should be one lieutenant-colonel, three majors, and three captains.

2271. I think you suggested that a colonel who may have commanded his regiment for five years, if not selected for the rank of major-general should succeed to the rank of major-general by seniority ?—Yes, on the retired list.

2272. But as this officer would be debarred from all the lucrative appointments of the army, do you think that it would be quite fair to reduce his income to 450*l.* or 400*l.* ?—I guarded myself by saying that it should not apply to the present generation. But I must say there is a difference between an officer who is recognised as being on active employment and another whose work is entirely done.

2273. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You have recommended, not only with reference to what we are inquiring into, namely, the question of promotion, but also as a tactical improvement that we should have the double company system ?—Yes.

2274. We have had it in evidence from General Walker, our military attaché at Berlin, that it is quite an open question in Germany, whether for tactical purposes the company is not so large that it will be reduced. Are you aware of that ?—No, I am not.

2275. General Walker says that the double company, or rather the Prussian company, which would be analogous to our double company, when extended is too large a command for one officer, who must dismount when he comes into close quarters with arms of precision, and he says that on that account it is quite an open question now, whether the larger company shall not be reduced. It would modify your opinion, would it not, if there was that practical objection to it ?—I do not think it would, because I think that the double companies succeeded exceedingly well in the last war.

2276. (*Chairman.*) One word with regard to the double companies put in the other aspect, that is to say, as a means of increasing promotion. The effect, no doubt, of having five majors and five captains in place of two majors and ten captains would be to make a certain number of men majors sooner than the captains under the old system could have become so, but as long as there remains but one colonel to a regiment, every step above the rank of major must be attained through that colonelcy, and therefore the general promotion of the whole of the subordinate ranks and of the majors must depend, after all, upon the removal of somebody from the top. Is not that so ?—Yes.

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

2277. Therefore, as regards what may be called the general flow of promotion through the regiment, whatever you may do by the system proposed in the way of quickening the step from captain to major, still provided you only have one outlet at the top of the regiment through the lieutenant-colonelcy, you cannot materially increase the flow of promotion either above or below those ranks, can you ?—Not to the higher ranks, but up to the rank of major I think it would be increased. There would be six field officers, out of which to make promotion, instead of three as at present.

2278. Let up drop the lieutenant-colonel, because he is the same for both systems, you have got five majors ?—Yes; there will be five majors to make promotions for, and therefore, up to the rank of major it seems to me that the promotion would be accelerated.

2279. Let us imagine a regiment with five majors in it and five captains, none of the officers below the rank of captain could get a step till either a major or a captain went ?—No.

2280. Then, of course, the chances of death would be the same for both systems, therefore, what woud there be to create a vacancy ?—It is more than the chance of death, because, according to the system at present, a major is an officer who holds his full pay commission only for five years.

2281. Would you apply the five years' rule rigidly to the five majors ?—Yes, certainly.

2282. (*Mr. Welby.*) That would make a heavier non-effective charge come upon the retired majors ?—Yes.

2283. (*Maj.-General Johnson.*) How would you dispose of the majors after they had completed their five years' service in that grade ?—They would either be re-appointed according to the rule which exists, or if it was not thought expedient to re-appoint them they would be put upon half-pay.

2284. (*Chairman.*) If you re-appointed them you would stop the flow of promotion would you not ?—Yes. That is exactly what the Duke of Cambridge can do now, and I suppose that it will very often happen. I know that when we decided upon that rule in 1871 we never contemplated that all those men who are in the very prime of life would be thrown upon the half-pay list. We quite contemplated that a very large proportion of them would be re-appointed.

2285. Then in that view of the five years' rule it would not act very strongly in favour of promotion ?—It would act to a certain extent, and the use of the five years' rule is that it enables the Commander-in-Chief to get rid of those without hurting them who have become feeble or unfit in a hundred ways.

2286. Viewed in that light it would seem to be a very small help towards the flow of promotion ?—That is certainly the way in which the five years' rule was contemplated in 1871, I think.

2287. (*Chairman.*) What is your opinion about the five years' rule, do you think that it is a good one ?—Yes, I am very much in favour of it.

2288. You mean in the aspect which you have just mentioned ?—Yes.

2289. Is it probable that in the majority of cases you would re-appoint the officers ?—I do not know about the majority, but a considerable proportion; there are a great number of instances in which you would be very much disposed to re-appoint them. On

Gen. Lord Sandhurst, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

29 April 1875.

the other hand, there are an equal number where you would not, but it would depend a good deal upon the knowledge that you have of the men, and so on.

2290. You regard it entirely from an army point of view, and not from the point of view of promotion ?—I regard it entirely from an efficiency point of view.

The witness withdrew.

Lieutenant-General Studholme J. Hodgson, examined.

Lieut.-Gen. S. J. Hodgson.

2291. (*Chairman.* You are a lieutenant-general, I believe ?—I am.

2292. Are you able to offer the Commission any suggestions with reference to the subject on which they are engaged ?—I have not given the subject very much consideration, for my opinions have been always so totally opposed to those of my brother officers in the army that I have never argued them much.

2293. On what points have they been so much opposed ?—I have always been a great enemy to purchase, and a great enemy to the enormous establishment of general officers.

2294. You would reduce the general officers' establishment ?—Most undoubtedly.

2295. To what extent would you propose to reduce the general officers' establishment ?—I consider that the rank of general might be abolished altogether, and that in time of peace 25 lieutenant-generals and 100 major-generals would fulfil all the requirements of the service.

2296. Therefore the total fixed establishment would be 125 ?—Yes. I should propose that the rank of general should be abolished or kept for particular occasions, which I shall have the honour of mentioning to the Commission as I go on. My idea is that there should be an effective list. First of all I would say that no general officer should be made from the rank of colonel except by selection, and that no man on the list of colonels on account of seniority should claim a right to be made a major-general.

2297. Before you pass on to your next propositions would you be good enough to state what you would do with colonels ?—I think it would be necessary that the first 100 colonels on the list should receive a liberal addition to their half-pay, say 200*l.* or 250*l.* a year, which would make something about the present pay of an unattached major-general; but that they should have no claim whatever from mere seniority to be made major-generals.

2298. Would that payment involve retirement from the army, or would they still be open to be selected ?—There would only be the first 100 colonels to receive this, all eligible for selection for major-general.

2299. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Are you alluding to the present colonels ?—No; I am referring to the future, for the formation of a new army, because of course we could not get rid of the present colonels.

2300. (*Chairman.*) You mean that you would give to the 100 senior colonels an addition to their half-pay of some 200*l.* or 250*l.* a year ?—Yes. I consider that the present system of promotion to the rank of major-general should not be maintained; and that the promotion should be made from the colonels at large absolutely by selection without regard to seniority. Under this system it would probably be necessary to give the first 100 colonels on the list the addition to their half-pay which I have mentioned, and when selection occurs from those 100 it should not be claimed as a matter of right. The entry upon this list to be attained solely by seniority. There should be only two classes of general officers, lieutenant generals and major-generals, the rank of general being abolished or retained for very peculiar cases, or it might be given to the lieutenant-generals placed on the retired list. There should be two lists, an active and a retired list. Twenty-five lieutenant-generals and 100 major-generals would, in my opinion, meet the requirements of the service in time of peace, and maintain a sufficient flow of promotion. Lieutenant-generals at the age of 65 and major-generals at the age of 60 to be placed on the retired list. It might be desirable for increasing the flow of promotion that general officers placed on the retired list by their own option or by compulsion, should receive that increased pension of 200*l.* a year as opportunity might arise. Of course the number of officers on this list must be kept within certain limits, and their retirement will therefore be on a pension immediate or deferred. General officers should be remunerated on a fixed scale from the date of their appointment; the lieutenant-generals at 1,000*l.* a year and the major-generals at 800*l.* Honorary colonelcies of regiments if retained should not be a source of emolument.

2301. Upon your system is the number on the retired list limited ?—The retired list would not be limited at all; only the list of those receiving pensions would be limited.

2302. Would not the number on the retired list who receive any emolument from it be limited ?—The number who receive an extra pension for being placed on the retired list must of course be limited.

2303. What would be the limit of the retired list ?—There are 25 lieutenant-generals, I will suppose, on the active list, and then there are 100 major-generals; of course year by year that retired list would be getting fuller and fuller, and therefore it would have to be decided how many of them should receive the extra pension immediate or deferred; and that would have to keep pace with the finances.

2304. Would your proposition be that no man should be placed or retained on the active list after attaining a certain age, but that he should pass on to the retired list ?—Precisely.

2305. Not by any voluntary act of his own, but by the mere fact of his attaining that age ?—Yes.

2306. If then he, by reason of his attaining a certain age, passes on to the retired list, do you say that it is questionable whether he will have any pay or any pension ?—He would have his lieutenant-general's pay, and then it might be advisable on his being placed on the retired list and having done with service to give him, as opportunity offered, the 200*l.* a year extra beyond his lieutenant-general's pay.

2307. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You would retire him on his full pay of lieutenant-general ?—Yes, he would retire upon his full pay of lieutenant-general.

2308. (*Chairman.*) Then he would be better off than a man who was still on the active list ?—Yes, he has done with the service; but then of course a man on the active list looks to a pension for length of service and for employment.

2309. Beside those two lists of lieutenant-generals you would have a list of colonels I presume ?—Yes.

2310. Would they also be receiving the sum of 200*l.* or 250*l.* a year beyond their half-pay ?—Yes, the first 100 would, because the probability is that a large proportion of them could never look forward to being general officers, and they would have no reason to complain.

2311. What do you say with respect to the mode of promotion in the ranks below ?—In the ranks below I conceive that the promotion should go regimentally up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel by seniority.

2312. You would temper that by selection under the discretion of the commander-in-chief ?—Yes, the commander-in-chief must have the power of selecting or else the officers might be too young or otherwise unfit, but I certainly would let the promotion go regimentally up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel as far as possible.

2313. As a mode of creating a flow of promotion, which, as you are aware, is not likely to take place at the same rate now as it did under the purchase system, would you propose any system of compulsory retiring

a man in any of those ranks after certain ages?—I consider that a lieutenant-colonel should not be kept at the head of a regiment after 55 years of age or a major after 45, and a captain should certainly be retired at 40.

2314. You mean if he has not by that time obtained promotion; if he is still a captain at 40 you would retire him?—Most certainly, but not to be applied to the ordnance corps, considering the mature age at which they enter and the nature of their service.

2315. With a pension of course?—Yes, of course with a pension or with unattached rank, with the prospect of coming in as a field officer, or of becoming a half-pay major with the prospect of being brought in.

2316. Would that be as good a system as retiring him altogether do you think?—I think that had better he left to him.

2317. What amount of pension would you propose to give him?—I do not suppose that any of those gentlemen would retire under their full pay if they have been from 25 to 30 years in the service.

2318. We are talking now of compulsory retirement, and therefore it is not a question of whether it would be accepted, but what you think should be the rate of retirement?—I should do that according to the number of years that they had been in the service. If a major had been 25 years in the service, not reckoning half pay, no one could complain of his retiring on full pay, or a lieutenant-colonel who had been 30 years in *bonâ fide* service.

2319. You think that the age of 45 is quite as old as a man ought to be in first obtaining the command of a regiment?—Yes, certainly; and for the sake of efficiency I do not think that he ought to be kept there after 55.

2320. And you think that a major ought not to be a major after 45, therefore, I presume that you think he ought to have become a lieutenant-colonel by that time?—Yes, certainly.

2321. What do you think of the system of brevet rank?—I think that the brevet system has been one of the most fatal systems that our army has almost ever seen.

2322. Would you abolish it altogether?—Yes, I would abolish it altogether.

2323. What would you substitute for it as a means of pushing forward deserving men?—The commander-in-chief will have power of selecting them for unattached promotion and bringing them in, and there will be opportunities of promoting them to other regiments.

2324. Do you think that that would be sufficient?—Yes, I think so; it would certainly create great dissatisfaction in the army giving brevet rank merely because the officers have held certain situations on the staff or have been a certain number of years in the service, perhaps on the staff chiefly. We may have in a regiment a man serving perhaps with the full rank of colonel and doing the duties of captain and far senior to the lieutenant-colonel of the regiment. I have seen enormous confusion and discord from that.

2325. You do not recognise any special merits in the brevet system that would induce you to continue it?—I do not see anything that would induce me to continue it.

2326. Everything that is done by it in the way of pushing forward deserving officers might be done, you think, through the system of unattached promotion, or through the system of direct promotion to a vacancy in another regiment?—Yes.

2327. What do you say of the system of appointments to the staff, do you think it is desirable that men should be re-appointed after they have served some time on the staff, or that the appointment should be given to others?—So long as the staff is not a separate corps, I certainly think it is very hard if they are kept on the staff and their regiments lose their services.

2328. If they were seconded how would it be?—I think that the army would consider it hard that the same set of men should retain the most coveted appointments.

2329. Have you had any experience of the working of the Staff College?—No, but I am certainly of opinion that the Staff College might be very much extended, but not by taking officers away from their regiments to do it.

2330. How would you do it if you did not take officers away from their regiments?—Those officers should be seconded, for there is no doubt that the establishment of the regiment is not at all too large for the requirements.

2331. What is your view about that, do you think that the general establishment of officers is too large?—No, not too large, but just sufficient. You cannot afford to take away officers from a regiment to go on to the staff.

2332. Is the present *cadre* sufficient for a regiment serving in India now?—Yes, certainly I consider it so.

2333. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Have you had any Indian experience?—Yes, I have been in India.

2334. In command?—Latterly I have been commander-in-chief in Ceylon and in the Straits Settlements also.

2335. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that one captain and two subalterns to a company are enough?—Yes, I think that is quite enough.

2336. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I presume you mean exclusive of absentees on the staff?—Yes. I wish it to be kept up most completely.

2337. (*Chairman.*) So that if any officer is taken away to the staff or to the Staff College he should be seconded?—Yes. Each company has three officers. You must make allowances for sick leave, and so on. There is one question which I should like to lay great stress upon, and it is this: I cannot conceive any circumstances where an officer in a regiment can be promoted over another officer in that corps; if he is, there will be discontent and a most dangerous race of men called into existence.

2338. What do you mean by a "dangerous race of men"?—Men who will breed discontent among the others and find fault with everything; we do not know what may occur if any convulsion took place such as we have seen in other countries.

2339. Therefore under no circumstances, whatever may be the merit of an officer, would you give him a step over his fellows in his own regiment?—No, I cannot conceive the possibility of it. I can fancy saying to a young man, You have been inefficient and idle and another officer is going to be promoted over you, but that would be a very different thing.

2340. Therefore you are in favour of passing over a man if he was inefficient and unfit for promotion, although you are not in favor of promoting one man over another by reason of any suggested superior merit?—No. Of course if a man happened not to be of proper character and another was put over him, he should not be allowed to remain in the regiment.

2341. What is your opinion of the confidential reports under the new system; do you think that they are sufficient to enable the commander-in-chief to judge?—I have not seen much of the new system, but speaking of the time when I was in command, four or five years ago, I think they were useless, either to bring an officer forward, or to get rid of a bad one.

2342. You are aware that great alterations have been made since then?—Yes, but from what I have heard I do not consider that the confidential reports are minute enough.

2343. Do you suppose that that arises from a disinclination on the part of the officers commanding to express an unfavorable opinion?—I do not think they are made in an unflinching spirit enough; they are made in too delicate a manner, and I do not think that the general officers are sufficiently minute and particular in their confidential reports upon the subject of commanding officers.

Lieut.-Gen. S. J. Hodgson.

29 April 1875.

2344. What do you mean by "upon the subject of commanding officers"?—They do not bring all the failings and faults of a commanding officer sufficiently to light to the commander-in-chief; whether they are afraid of hurting the discipline or not I do not know.

2345. Do you think that they know them?—Yes, I think that they must know them.

2346. But do they flinch from giving full expression to them?—I think they do flinch certainly, whereas I would rather myself report upon an inefficient lieutenant-colonel than upon half a dozen inferior officers.

2347. Because it is more important?—Yes, it is more important to get rid of them, and the others perhaps may improve under a proper man.

2348. Can you suggest a method by which a better system could be carried out?—No, except a more minute confidential report, and such being acted upon.

2349. And greater rigidness in exacting it from the general officer?—Yes. Until now I think it was very difficult to get rid of an officer. I knew a drunken man at the head of a regiment and they kept him I do not know how long, although every one knew his habits.

2350. That was before this new system, was it not? Yes, that was before the new system, but it is within the last six years. I consider that the absence of an unfavourable report ought to be sufficient to command promotion in a regiment, but in the case of promotion out of a regiment a great deal more is required than the simple absence of an unfavourable report.

2351. Have you formed any opinion as to the period of service before an officer is promoted?—I consider that there should be a certain definite period of service before an officer could be promoted, and another period after which he ought not to be on the active list.

2352. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) And that he must have served a certain time in the rank before he could get his next step?—Yes.

2353. Can you suggest any period?—No, except that I should not recommend an officer to be made a lieutenant-colonel under 15 years' service, and an effective field officer under 10.

2354. You are aware that there is no rigid rule upon the subject, but that the commander-in-chief now possesses the power and exercises it, and that where promotion has gone too rapidly in a regiment he brings in a man from another regiment?—Yes.

2355. That is the way in which you would limit it?—Yes, that has always been the case even under the purchase system. I do not think that the proposition about the promotion by merit would answer at all.

2356. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) With regard to those confidential reports: have any general officers' confidential reports ever passed through your hands?—They have not passed through my hands officially, but I have seen them.

2357. You never had to review them?—No, I never had to review them, because I have not had general officers under me, but I have repeatedly found fault with the confidential reports of commanding officers. I also would take the liberty of saying that I consider the authorities would not only find it practicable, but that it would receive general support, if they removed an officer either for inefficiency or for badness of character.

2358. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I suppose in a regiment, particularly in a good regiment, it is pretty well known amongst the officers themselves whether a man is a bad one or not?—Yes.

2359. And if it is fairly done it would be recognised as being fairly done?—Yes, it would be very popular in the army in every regiment as a way of getting rid of a bad subject.

2360. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) If the commanding officer sends in an insufficient or inadequate confidential report, it is open to the general, and in fact it is the duty of the general to correct it in his remarks upon that confidential report?—Yes, of course it would be, and is always done.

2361. You stated just now that you knew that the commanding officers' reports very often were not quite what they ought to be, but the inspecting-general would be able to correct that from his own knowledge if he knew the regiment?—Yes, if he knew the regiment, certainly.

2362. A major-general inspecting a regiment of course sends in his inspection report, based upon what he has seen, and what the officer commanding the regiment puts before him, and if he sees that the report of the commanding officer is not what it ought to be, it is his duty to point it out for the information of his superior officer in his confidential report?—Of course he could do so, and he does so. My confidential reports from Ceylon went to the commander-in-chief.

2363. You, as general commanding in Ceylon, made your own confidential reports?—Yes.

2364. Had you power to put in any remarks that you liked concerning the officers in the regiment?—Yes, which I did, but then there was no other general officer to revise it; it went direct to the commander-in-chief.

2365. (*Chairman.*) Have you anything to say with respect to promotion on the staff?—There is one remark which I wish to make about giving increased promotion on the staff, that I consider it would give general dissatisfaction in the army.

2366. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Those staff appointments are very much coveted in the army, are they not?—Yes, independently of the pay and social advantages, they take you away from that most wretched thing, four or five years' drudgery of barrack life.

2367. Have you commanded a regiment yourself in the course of service?—Yes.

2368. Have you ever been before the enemy; that is to say, have you ever commanded a regiment in action?—No, not in action; only as a subaltern officer.

2369. I presume that you have been in action?—Yes.

2370. In what rank?—Only as lieutenant.

2371. (*Chairman.*) You are aware that some people entertain the opinion now that it would be desirable to alter the organisation of the regiment and to create a large number of majors and a smaller number of captains, have you formed any opinion about that?—I do not think it would answer. It would be desirable if you could to equalize the field officers of the line and the ordnance, but taking a general view, I consider that having large companies commanded by majors would be injurious to our regimental system.

2372. Can you point to any specific evils which would follow from it?—There would be a good deal of conflict of authority in the regiment.

2373. It has been suggested that field officers would hardly like to take upon themselves a great many of the routine duties which now devolve on captains, and which, as captains, they perform cheerfully, but which as field officers they would hardly like to perform, do you agree with that opinion?—Yes; a man would be a field officer of a couple of companies instead of being a field officer of a regiment.

2374. Would they be willing to perform the duties which now devolve upon the captains?—I do not think they would. As regards the system itself it seems to me that officers with brevet rank do their regimental duties with very great reluctance.

2375. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In your own regiment, when you commanded it, if you had been called upon confidentially to recommend to the commander-in-chief such officers under your command as you thought specially qualified for staff duties, would you have been able to pick out two or three amongst your officers?—I do not think I should.

2376. You think that there was such a general equality of merit among them that it would have been difficult to make a selection?—Not that, but I should

have pronounced none fit, except for post of aide-de-camp.

2377. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) With reference to your suggestion to abolish the rank of general, have you considered how that would affect our army in case we were allied with a foreign army, as we were in the Crimea?—I say I would reserve the rank of general for special cases; you might give him the local rank of general or field-marshal if necessary.

2378. You must recollect that in determining rank as between two general officers you must go back to the date of the commission of that rank. If we met the French army, who have a number of full generals in command of divisions of that army, our own generals, who had been merely temporarily appointed for that purpose, would be at a discount, and they would always be juniors?—I should consider that a lieutenant-general in our service is just the same as a general of division in the French army, it is the same rank.

2379. He would be surbordinate to him in the field, would he not?—No; in Buonaparte's time it was always a general of division, but directly the Royalists came back again they altered the rank of general of division to lieutenant-general.

2380. If I am right in my view that a French general is a superior officer to a lieutenant-general in the British army, do not you think that that would be a fatal objection to what you propose?—He would only be according to seniority, if he was a senior general of division he would naturally be senior to our lieutenant-general.

2381. (*Chairman.*) You think that it does not signify by what name you call him?—No; if you like to call him general, call him general; but I cannot see the use of generals in our service, except, as I say, to give it on particular exigencies.

2382. Have you any observations to make with regard to the system of cramming?—I venture to say that I consider that nothing could be more fatal in the long run than the present system of cramming, for I think that it will keep many gentlemen who have received a liberal and good education from competing. They will not condescend to the ignoble system of cramming. At the same time, there is one question which I think is very important to consider, and that is, whether it is probable that this system will keep young men of good circumstances out of the army, who having a private fortune would be likely to retire early. That may be so, but I must dissent from what is implied by this question that it is desirable to get into the army men of good circumstances with a view to their early retirement; those men I say are useless, and more than that they do great injury to the service by setting an example of extravagance.

2383. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) It has been thought that the fact of gentlemen coming into the service and serving five or six years, until they come into possession of their property and then leaving the service, form an admirable class both for the yeomanry and the militia?—I only look at the army, and I think it does harm a man coming in and saying "I shall stop "a few years and then leave." Such men set a bad example of extravagance, and are not worth anything to the army.

2384. (*Chairman.*) Is it not a fact that you want a certain number of men to go forward to become colonels and lieutenant-generals and major-generals, and on the other hand you have not got room in those upper ranks for the large number that are required for service in the lower ranks, so that you really want a certain number of people who will be content to come in and go out again, and if those men do their duty while there, do you see any detriment to the army from their forming a part of that class?—I do not think they do any good to the army.

2385. Beyond that of doing their duty?—Just so. I should certainly prefer men who came into it with a view to making it their profession.

2386. But you see you have not got room for them all; you would have to retire them when they got to 40 years of age, and you would have to pay them to go out?—Yes.

2387. Those men that we are talking of are willing to go out without being paid, and that is an advantage, is it not?—At the end of six or seven years, if they are captains, they would not like to throw up their commissions for nothing.

2388. Perhaps for a less sum than you would feel bound to give them if they lived until they were 40 years old before leaving the army?—That may be, but I do not think that they do any good.

2389. Have you considered whether voluntary retirement should be brought about by offering either a pension or a lump sum of money?—It is only in peculiar circumstances that you would offer a lump sum of money, that is where people were not entitled to a pension from length of service. I would give them a pension for length of service, but I would not give them a lump sum of money. I would give a lump sum of money to those who were not entitled to a pension and who had not served long enough.

2390. Supposing that the system was to give a pension after a certain number of years' service commensurate to the length of service, and besides that in order to empty the lower ranks somewhat and create a flow of promotion, you were to offer a lump sum of money much smaller than what a permanent pension would represent after a limited number of years' service, would that meet your views?—I consider that it would be accepted in many cases.

2391. You think that it would be a useful method of creating promotion as far as it went?—I do not think it would in the higher ranks at all. In some of the younger ranks it would, and in some of the semi-civil and semi-military ranks, but that would bring in I suppose seven or eight years' service.

2392. Say that it is from 10 to 15 years under the rank of major in the case of captain and subaltern, might not such a system be applied to those ranks with success?—Yes, I should think for them it would not be an unfair scale to offer 100*l.* for each year's service.

2393. Irrespective of whether it is home or foreign service?—Yes, I would give it for length of service, but not for time not serving.

2394. And that you think might be accepted by the officers?—I think it would be accepted by many men, for instance, married men getting a family about them, and wanting to enter into business, or some speculation of that sort.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Monday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Monday, 3rd May 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, Esq., C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Brigadier-General SIR JOHN ADYE, K.C.B., R. Art.

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

2395. (*Chairman.*) What position do you now hold?—Director of artillery.

2396. How long have you held that appointment?—Five years.

2397. You have been always in the artillery, have you not?—Yes.

2398. The organization of the artillery is different, is it not, from that of the line, with regard to the number of officers, and so forth?—To some extent it differs from the line.

2399. And the artillery of course was not a purchase arm of the service?—No.

2400. We understand that now, under the changes which have taken place since the abolition of purchase, both with reference to the artillery, to the engineers, and to the line, there is an absolute power vested in the Commander-in-Chief of filling up vacancies by selection?—If there is the power of selection for the artillery it has never been exercised. I think it is hardly possible to select in the artillery.

2401. Therefore, do I understand you that in the artillery the promotion is entirely by seniority?—Promotion is entirely by seniority. I would mention that the artillery is not a regiment of a small cadre, but it is a whole service in one list.

2402. And the promotion in that service goes by seniority in that service?—Yes.

2403. Am I to understand that that has prevailed without exception?—I think there are no exceptions, except in cases of subalterns who have not passed the qualifying examination for captain, who have of late years in a few instances been passed over.

2404. That examination being made a *sine quâ non* for promotion?—Yes.

2405. Whatever absolute power there may be, is there no power exercised by the Commander-in-Chief of holding back from promotion any man whom he does not deem fit?—I do not think that such a power has ever been exercised, but probably a certain number of officers who are unfit have been retired.

2406. How was the unfitness of officers, such a you are alluding to, ascertained or made known to the Commander-in-Chief; was it under any system?—By means of confidential reports which come in periodically, and by means of other reports which come in when circumstances render them necessary.

2407. Does the system of confidential reports which applies to the rest of the army apply also to the artillery?—Yes.

2408. And if a man is reported upon unfavourably, and the Commander-in-Chief, instituting what inquiries he thinks fit upon that report, comes to the conclusion that he is unfit, I presume he does not promote him?—We have no instances of officers having been passed over and remaining in the regiment, except subalterns.

2409. But are there cases of officers who are unfit being passed over, and consequently going out of the regiment?—I should suppose they were. They do not come publicly forward.

2410. Probably they get a hint to retire before the occasion for promotion arises. That is the way in which you think it is done where there is incompetency?—Yes.

2411. Is that system of promotion, do you think, satisfactory?—The present system of promotion has not been satisfactory, because the proportions of the ranks have not enabled it to be so.

2412. I do not mean with reference to rapidity; but is the system of promotion by seniority in the corps, coupled with a power of rejecting any man who has shown himself unfit for promotion, a system which is satisfactory so far as merit is concerned, and efficiency in the corps?—I do not think in a large service (like the royal artillery) that it is possible to help it, because it would be very invidious to leave a man in the regiment, and to pass others over his head; whereas in the line you may bring in an officer from another regiment, or from the half-pay list, without its being so marked as it would be in the royal artillery.

2413. In the line there seems to be a very general opinion that it would be impracticable to lift one officer over the heads of his brother officers in their regiment, and you say that the artillery for the purposes of promotion constitute a regiment, they practically being all one body?—Yes.

2414. Therefore you think that any system of promotion under any idea of superior merit, and under which one man was lifted over the heads of others, would not be satisfactory?—It would not.

2415. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Unless the people above him were all shunted, do I understand you to say that those whose heads he passed over, you think ought to go?—I think that in the artillery or in any regiment, to put a man over his senior renders the position of the senior very invidious; but there is power with a regiment of infantry to bring a man in from another regiment and pass over an officer without its being so invidious, but that power does not exist in the royal artillery because the royal artillery is one great service all in one list.

2416. Then I understand you to say that if that was attempted to be done in the artillery it would involve the officer who was superseded leaving the service?—I think he must do so; it would be so invidious that he must be retired.

2417. (*Chairman.*) In the artillery is there any system under which a man obtains promotion otherwise than by seniority?—Yes, brevet.

2418. With the exception of brevet is there any?—No.

2419. And unattached promotion, I suppose?—We have no unattached promotion. All our officers are on full pay, and always serving.

2420. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Are there none on temporary half pay on account of sickness?—There have been a few cases of temporary half pay of late years on account of sickness.

2421. (*Chairman.*) But that is quite exceptional?—Yes, quite.

2422. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Have you not a few

colonels who have no employment?—We have colonels who are not employed, but they are on full pay awaiting employment.

2423. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) But eligible for employment at any moment?—Yes; eligible for employment at any moment like general officers.

2424. (*Chairman.*) After what number of years' service, generally, does a man obtain the rank of captain in the artillery?—Promotion in the royal artillery has varied excessively. It was very slow for many years after the Peninsula war, owing to the great reductions. The regiment then got very old in all ranks, and for a certain number of years it was very slow. It then became comparatively rapid, and that rapidity was increased by the large augmentations in consequence of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny; therefore of late years the promotion has been much more rapid than it was 30 years ago, but we are beginning to suffer a period of retardation, because the upper ranks are now comparatively young, and the subalterns therefore are getting old, and that state of affairs was considered by Lord Cardwell, who made great changes in the proportion of the ranks and introduced other measures, which I think ought to be carried out in the other branches of the service.

2425. Will you state what those changes were which you think are applicable to the other arms of the service as well?—A principle of readjustment of the ranks was carried out to a certain extent. For instance, all colonels and lieutenant-colonels holding staff employment or civil employments were made supernumerary. 12 lieutenant-colonels were added to the regiment for duty with the auxiliary forces, which was good for the auxiliary forces, and for the royal artillery also, as adding to the number in the upper ranks. The first captains were made majors, not only for the purposes of promotion, but because their important duties required it.

2426. Were they made substantive majors?—Yes, substantive majors with pay as such.

2427. And a regimental position, I suppose?—Yes, one subaltern of each garrison battery was also reduced. By this re-adjustment of the ranks the royal artillery were much improved, and it will be found also that the royal artillery work with fewer officers than any other branch of the service, especially the cavalry.

2428. To get a more simple view of those changes, to begin with, was the entire number of officers increased or diminished by the changes which you have just enumerated?—No, the result was not to increase the number. We had in January 1870, 106 colonels and lieutenant-colonels, and we have now 130, but the reduction of the subalterns was much larger.

2429. Then you got 24 colonels and lieutenant-colonels added; what was the number of subalterns suppressed?—I cannot state the precise number, but I should say that upwards of 80 lieutenants were reduced.

2430. Then upon the whole there was a reduction in the number of officers?—Yes.

2431. But I presume there was an increase in the pay list, seeing that those who were added were added to the higher grades?—There was an increase in the pay list; but it was considered that it was far better by this readjustment of the ranks to spend money on officers serving than to adopt the counter scheme of pensions to men to leave the regiment and do nothing. It was considered far more economical, and I believe that the actuaries of the War Office can prove that to be the case.

2432. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you refer in those figures to what is known by the name of the old royal artillery, or do you include the Indian cadres as well?—I am taking only the old royal artillery, because they are the normal, and the other cadres are gradually dying out; and although the rule was applied to the others to some extent, I thought it was better to take the regiment which was the normal, than to confuse you with figures of corps of which the subalterns are already gone and the captains are dying out. But I may say that the principle of the upper ranks has been partially carried out in the Indian cadres; but the reduction of subalterns was not carried out with them, because I believe the Indian Government objected to the reduction of a subaltern from the garrison batteries on account of the climate.

2433. (*Chairman.*) Independently of expense, and independently of the plan of promotion with regard to efficiency, is this change desirable do you think, and has it been successful?—I think it has been successful, and it is one which I wish to see applied to the other branches of the service.

2434. Will you explain to the Commission how you propose to apply it?—There are three main principles by which army promotion should be regulated. The first is a readjustment of the ranks, the second is a voluntary, coupled with a modified compulsory retirement at the top, and the third is giving outlets to the junior ranks. As regards the readjustment of the ranks, I think that in the infantry and the cavalry you should organize the infantry by double companies, and the cavalry by squadrons. In fact the cavalry in the field do work by squadrons. The double companies of infantry and the squadrons of cavalry should be commanded by majors. Tactically that would have advantages, because it would give the majors more employment, and would divide the regiment into larger groups under a mounted officer. There are rather too many young officers at present in every regiment. The large number of captains and subalterns compared to the small number of officers in the upper ranks renders quick promotion almost impossible, except at enormous cost.

2435. You say that the numbers in the lower ranks are too large, and that they create a difficulty in promotion, and you also say that as a means of meeting that difficulty to some extent, at any rate you would increase the number of majors at, I suppose, the expense of a number of captains. You would make the greater number of those offices which are captaincies majorities?—Yes, I would reduce the subalterns a little. I would reduce the captains and increase the majors.

2436. How many captains would you have in a battalion, and how many majors?—Five majors, six captains, and 14 subalterns, including a captain as adjutant.

2437. But you would still only have one lieutenant-colonel?—Yes.

2438. As long as there was but one lieutenant-colonel, although the effect of your scheme might be to make a certain number more majors who under the present system would only be captains, still if there was but one outlet at the top through the lieutenant-colonelcy, the stream of promotion right down through the regiment would not be accelerated, would it?—No.

2439. Therefore when you get to the lieutenant-colonels, you must devise another scheme and bring other forces into play to assist the promotion in that rank, or you must empty that office after a certain time?—Yes, certainly, and I shall come to this presently. This table embodies an outline of the scheme which I have mentioned.

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

Present.					Proposed.				
Rank.	Service Companies.	Depôt.	Total.	Approximate Cost.	Rank.	Service Companies.	Depôt.	Total.	Approximate Cost.
				£					£
Lieut.-Colonels - -	1	—	1	400	Lieut.-Colonels -	1	—	1	400
Majors - - -	1	1	2	600	Majors - -	4	1	5	1,500
Captains - -	8	2	10	2,000	Captains (including Adjutant).	5	1	6	1,200
Subalterns (including Adjutant).	14*	2	16	1,600	Subalterns - -	12*	2	14	1,400
	24	5	29	4,600		22	4	26	4,500
					Add forage for 3 additional Majors -				100
					Total - - £				4,600

* Add 4 to Foreign Battalions.

Proportions - { Present, 3 Field Officers to 26 juniors. Proposed, 6 do. 20 do.

I want to point out the difference in the proportions in the upper ranks of field officers to juniors. At present it is 3 to 26, or 1 to 8⅔rds and my proposal would give it 6 to 20, or 1 to 3⅓rd, so that without costing anything you would have a totally different state of affairs up to the rank of major.

2440. There would be a certain number of offices better paid than that of captain, namely, majorities, which would be so far an improvement in the promotion of the young officers, because instead of rising to the rank of captain and remaining captains they would become majors?—Quite so.

2441. But if you kept the office of lieutenant-colonel in the same position as it is now, and you did not adopt any means to render that office more frequently vacant than it is now, the flow of promotion through the regiment would remain the same?—First of all I would observe that the creation of lieutenant-colonels to brigade depôts is one outlet to the higher ranks which has been adopted, and which has added to the number in that rank, and the lieutenant-colonels from the army would of course be eligible to go into those appointments, and into the higher staff appointments. I also would propose that certain voluntary and compulsory retirements should begin at the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

2442. Would you act rigidly upon the present rule as to the five years?—I think the five years rule is a good one, but that it should be at the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief to extend it, certainly to seven years.

2443. To what extent would you propose that that discretion should be used or exercised, because upon that would depend very much the effect of that rule upon promotion?—I do not think it would depend very much upon that, because presently, in speaking of retirement, I shall state how I would deal with the lieutenant-colonel of a regiment.

2444. At present the only means of vacating the office of lieutenant-colonel, otherwise than by the voluntary retirement of the officer in question, is by acting upon the five years rule; at the end of five years he vacates the office, and so creates promotion; but if that rule is not acted upon to any extent, of course promotion would be to that extent very much diminished?—Yes.

2445. Instead of rigidly adhering to the five years rule you would look to some other method of vacating the office?—Yes; and I would give the Commander-in-Chief the power of extending the command after five years if he thought it desirable.

2446. Would you act upon the five years rule with regard to majors?—No, I think not, because by providing a system of retirement partially voluntary and partially compulsory for all ranks above major, that would not be necessary.

2447. How would you propose to empty the ranks above lieutenant-colonel by a partly voluntary and a partly compulsory retirement?—The question of retirement is the most difficult of all, and it is impossible to do more than sketch out certain broad principles. First of all, do not establish a graduated scale of pensions, by which comparatively young officers can at stated periods retire at will on pension to do nothing, because it would be excessive in cost, and it would have a tendency to induce the best officers to leave the army and those of less ability to remain. I wish to mention that this view is rather in opposition to evidence which I gave some years ago, because I have since become convinced that it is not the best way of spending money to give early or comparatively early retirements on a graduated scale. I think retirements in the upper ranks should be by age, both voluntary and compulsory, but the latter with limitations and exceptions; that is to say, age coupled with non-employment, should lead to compulsory retirement. A hard-and-fast rule of mere age is not desirable, because it would remove distinguished men and be a loss to the State, and it is not practised in other professions. Pensions for ill-health should be specially considered. A captain after 15 years' service might be allowed to retire upon half pay for 10 years, provided he were willing to serve in the militia for that time.

2448. And then what would happen?—And then his half pay would cease. I think all officers of 30 years service might be allowed to retire on full pay. A lieutenant-colonel at 55 years of age should no longer remain in command of a regiment, but should be eligible for the staff or a brigade depôt. An officer to command a regiment must be physically fit to endure exposure, and therefore comparatively young. At 55 years old he might have the offer of a pension of say 400*l.* a year to retire; but if he was not willing, then he could remain on a lower rate until promoted to major-general.

2449. Remain on half pay do you mean?—Yes, on half pay or an unattached rate of pay, lower than full pay, until promoted to major-general; but if he is not a general at 60, or if he has not been employed for seven years after leaving the regiment, he should be compulsorily retired, whatever his age, on 400*l.* a year.

2450. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Is this the retirement that you would give to all branches of the service, artillery and everything else?—Yes. I think that the line should have their ranks readjusted very much as was done with the royal artillery, and that we should then start on the same general footing, and should have the same scale of retirement.

2451. (*Chairman.*) Do you put that at 400*l.*, or do you say full pay?—Lieutenant-colonels of all branches retiring at 55 voluntarily I think might have the offer of a pension of 400*l.* a year.

2452. That is quite irrespective of his full pay?—Quite so, but it is more than the full pay of a lieutenant-colonel.

2453. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) But he would be full colonel at that time?—No, we have until lately hardly ever had a full colonel of artillery at 35 years' service.

2454. At the present moment any colonel of artillery

can retire upon 600*l.* a year?—Yes, if there is a vacancy.

2455. And that rate extends to every officer who was in the corps previous to Lord Cardwell's new rule, which limited the rate to 400*l.* a year and 600*l.* a year after 40 years' service?—His proposal was full pay after 30 years' service up to a limit, and 600*l.* a year after 40 years' service without limit. I must tell you that an officer of the royal artillery retiring after 30 years service as full colonel cannot do so as a right, it depends whether there is a vacancy.

2456. Is it not also true that they do not take it, and that this year several of those pensions have lapsed into the Treasury?—There are some of those pensions which have not been taken this year.

2457. (*Chairman.*) Will you proceed with your proposition?—A major-general at 60 should, I think, be permitted to retire upon 600*l.* a year, and any major-general of 60 or upwards, not employed for five years, should retire compulsorily.

2458. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) May at 60 and must at 65, is that your answer?—Yes, or if not employed for five years whatever his age. Then again a lieutenant-general at 65 may, I think, be permitted to retire upon 800*l.* a year, or if not employed for five years he must retire on 800*l.* a year. Again a general should be allowed to retire at any time on 1,200*l.* a year, and if not employed for five years must so retire. I would have a small fixed active list of generals and an elastic retired list, but I think that generals of any age may be employed in pure administration, whether retired or not. I mean employments such as in the War Office, because the object should be that you should not arbitrarily cut yourself off from employing distinguished men, who would be very useful to the State. At the same time you should provide a loophole for officers of old age, and who are not likely to be employed, by giving them liberal pensions.

2459. (*Chairman.*) As to the detail of your scheme, you say it is an elastic retired list and a fixed list of active generals?—Yes, certainly a fixed active list of generals.

2460. Do you suggest any number for that?—No, I do not.

2461. But as to the elastic list of retired generals, what do you contemplate, on what is the number to depend?—The number would depend upon the number of officers who took those voluntary and compulsory retirements which I have mentioned.

2462. The number in the general rank in the army who reach the grade of major-general without having retired, and who do not retire under your various retirements that you offer to the different grades of generals?—Who do retire; it would be an elastic list, all those who do retire would go into the elastic retired list.

2463. Then the retired list is a list of those who have those pensions?—Yes, that is, a retired list elastic in the way I have described.

2464. That must depend upon circumstances such as you cannot give a figure for?—I cannot give a figure.

2465. Then as to your active list, have you any figure in your mind for it?—I should like rather a small active list.

2466. Do you contemplate the active list being larger in point of numbers than the number of commands or employments that are open?—Yes, somewhat larger than the actual number of employments certainly.

2467. There would be a certain number unemployed?—Yes.

2468. Do you contemplate any limit of age for those who occupy places under the active list?—I have already indicated that officers of a certain age in each rank must go on the retired list, and that at any age, if they are not employed for five years, general officers should go on the retired list.

2469. Do you propose that the places on the active list are to be occupied by seniority?—Certainly, seniority in all branches of the army.

2470. (*Lord Hampton.*) Then your retired list would be unlimited as I understand?—Yes.

2471. (*Chairman.*) Your general principle then would be this, that taking the matter of promotion up from the rank of colonel, you would propose that the colonels of the whole army should go forward by pure seniority?—Yes.

2472. And that as they went forward they should divide themselves into two lists on the generals' establishment, on the retired list and on the active list?—Yes.

2473. The retired list would consist of those who had either arrived at an age when the voluntary retirement was open to them, and who had accepted it, or had arrived at a still further advanced age under which they had been compulsorily retired?—Yes, or had not been employed.

2474. And the residue who had not fallen into either of those categories would constitute the active list?—Yes, but the active list must be a fixed number.

2475. The effect of fixing the number on the active list would of course be slightly to restrict the promotion and hold it in check, and the effect of that would be to thrust others on to the retired list, having arrived at that period of age?—Yes. I am anxious to draw the attention of the Commission to the naval retiring scheme, which is something on that principle, that is to say, age, coupled with non-employment, leads to enforced retirement. But there is another part of their scheme which I do not follow, namely, to carry the enforced retirement lower down in the ranks, because the navy is a different service to the army. The young officers of the navy are not as a matter of course employed, for the lieutenants or commanders or captains may be many years on halfpay unemployed, but that does not prevail in the army.

2476. You say that you would copy the navy system. Have you any reason to suppose that that is a satisfactory system?—I believe it is a satisfactory system in that respect.

2477. Does it create sufficient promotion to satisfy the navy now, do you think?—I believe it will. It had not been long enough at work yet. It was only introduced, I think, in 1870.

2478. In this scheme I do not perceive that you have any proposal for getting rid of the majors. What do you propose to do with them? Are they all to wait until there is a vacancy in the lieutenant-colonelcy—As a lieutenant-colonel could not be there after 55 years old, and as the whole of the higher staff appointments will be supernumerary, and further, as the creation of colonels for the brigade depôts would give a flow of lieutenant-colonels from the regiments, these measures would enable the majors to get their promotion in proper time.

2479. Have you at all reduced that to a matter of figures, to ascertain how often you would have to empty the office of lieutenant-colonel in order to give promotion to your majors; because you will recollect you have five majors?—There is another way in which the majors may go, by retiring on full pay after 30 years' service.

2480. Would it be satisfactory to keep the majors in the regiments until they were 50 years old?—I would rather see a major made lieutenant-colonel sooner of course, and would give the option to majors of 30 years' service, who would be about 48 years old, to retire on full pay.

2481. But you would not do it any earlier than that?—I would give an officer of 15 years' service the option to go into the militia—I do not like giving young officers money to leave the army.

2482. Have you made any calculations which would enable you to say with any degree of certainty, regard being had to the proposals you make for vacating the office of lieutenant-colonel, whether majors would get their promotion within a reasonable limit of time?—No; I have no suggestion to make beyond those which I have made for getting rid of the lieutenant-

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

colonels: it would be for an actuary to work out the scheme.

2483. A good deal would depend, would it not, upon the result of that actuarial calculation?—Yes. At all events my scheme will do a great deal more than is done at present in the way of promotion for the majors.

2484. What new elements do you bring to bear to vacate the office of lieutenant-colonel, and so make way for the majors, because at present there is the five years rule, under which the lieutenant-colonel must go at the end of five years, if it is rigidly adhered to, and there are all those commands of depôt brigades, and there is the chance of the lieutenant-colonel choosing to go himself without any further stimulus. What other exit is there under your scheme?—He must leave his regiment at 55.

2485. At the age that you contemplate his getting the command of a brigade depôt, would he not be leaving the regiment in less than five years?—It might be so. The promotion in regiments is unequal. He might get the regiment very young.

2486. If the number of years that has been taken as the standard is about 18 or 20 years to become a major, and 25 to become a lieutenant-colonel, it would make him 45 when he became lieutenant-colonel?—Yes.

2487. Then the five years' rule, if it was acted upon, would vacate his office at 50?—Quite so.

2488. At 50 it would be 30 years' service?—Yes.

2489. Therefore, 30 years' service would not give you any earlier means of getting rid of him than the five years?—Yes. You are supposing that he becomes lieutenant-colonel after 25 years' service.

2490. That is the average?—It is hoped to be so, but I do not think that has ever been kept up to in time of peace.

2491. In the Commission on which we are sitting we are asked to ascertain what the rate of promotion was before purchase was abolished, and to suggest some scheme of promotion and retirement under which a similar rapidity of promotion may be attained, and therefore everything becomes a question of figures in this matter, and the difficulty that may exist in such a plan as you have put forward is that it may not give that required promotion. It appears to be very much a question of figures, which perhaps you have not hitherto worked out exactly?—No, it is a very difficult subject, but I think that my proposals would benefit all ranks up to lieutenant-colonel very much, and would partially benefit the majors. If you thought proper to introduce half pay after 25 years there would be no objection to that.

2492. That exists, does it not?—Yes, it now exists, but we might maintain it.

2493. Everybody is entitled to go on half pay after 25 years?—Yes, and you might retain it.

2494. That is not largely acted upon, is it? A man of 25 years' service is not apt to take the option to go on half pay?—I am not aware.

2495. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) In your own regiment you mean?—It is not much in the artillery.

2496. (*Chairman.*) Under the old purchase system, when a man went on half pay for some reason or other, he could exchange back to full pay, but now he cannot do that?—A certain number of officers in the royal artillery have accepted half pay after 25 years' service, and a considerable number of officers of the army I imagine also have been in the habit of doing the same. I think it would be exactly in the future as it has been in the past, that those who are tolerably well off will take it. The instances in the artillery are chiefly men who have good private means, and who do not wish to serve on.

2497. Who have motives of their own for wishing to give up active service, and who can afford therefore to take half pay?—Quite so.

2498. You have given the ages at which officers should retire; let us now go on to the question of efficiency; what age do you think would be best for a man to take the command of a regiment; at what period of his life do you think he is at his prime for that species of employment?—I think that a man is fit to command a regiment any time after 30 if he can only get it, but he should not hold it after 55.

2499. And you would prefer as a matter of efficieney men of 35 to command regiments?—Yes, or 40.

2500. Forty is about the age you would select as the best and most efficient?—I think so.

2501. Do you attribute much importance to having officers as field officers at an early period of life, when they are full of physical energy?—Yes, I think officers in command of a regiment or field officers of a regiment should be men in the prime of life.

2502. And capable of sustaining great physical exertion if required of them?—Yes, or the hardships that are incident to a campaign.

2503. You made a remark which has been made by some others, that under any system by which a pension was given to officers, the best officers you think would be likely to leave, but is that remark founded on experience or upon anticipation?—It is partly experience and partly anticipation. I think it is evident that if you offer pensions to comparatively young men to retire and do nothing, the probabilities are that chiefly the best will go, because if a man has some ability, and can take a pension, he feels that he may be able to take up another kind of profession or life; whereas a man who has either no ability, or who is indolent, will remain in the army because no other career opens to him.

2504. Is it not the case that what may be called a good officer, that is a man who is thoroughly fitted for the military profession, is fond of his profession and takes to it genially?—Doubtless.

2505. Surely such men amongst a number, if you picked out those who were the best officers, would be fond of their profession, and would feel themselves conscious of the possession of certain military capacities, and they would naturally and probably successfully look forward to promotion. What reason is there to suppose that a man so situated would give up his profession which he was fond of in order to go out into some other walk of life?—Because he may anticipate that the promotion of his regiment will be slow, that it may be going abroad, or he is married, and therefore on the whole he says (perhaps unwillingly), I must retire.

2506. Would not the same reasons act more powerfully upon a man who was conscious that he might not expect promotion, because he was not specially fitted for it, a man who was lazy and indolent and unwilling to go abroad, and incur the hardships of actual service; would not it act more powerfully upon him if he saw the means of getting into civil life in some less active and less troublesome position?—No; I think that a man with small ability and energy is quite aware that he probably would not get on in civil life, and therefore would not leave his regiment.

2507. Of course those are very much matters of surmise?—To a certain extent they are, but I think it is a false principle to encourage young officers to retire to the clubs.

2508. The difficulty that you have to grapple with by some system is that you want for the army the services of a certain limited number of officers in the higher ranks, and cotemporaneously with that at all time there must be a much larger number serving in the lower ranks; if you are to give promotion to those in the lower ranks, that is, if you are not to get rid of them by pension or a sum of money, and are to find promotion for them, you must pay those in the upper ranks, and you must pay more than you would if you are to give promotion to them all, because you want a much more limited number than the number of which the lower ranks are composed?—Therefore my proposal is to meet the case in three ways; first, by a readjustment of the proportions of the ranks, which I have explained; secondly, by a modified compulsory retirement at the top; and thirdly, which I have not yet gone into, by giving outlets to junior officers at the bottom to retire into civil life. As to outlets, one which now

exists is for subalterns, who have the power of going into the Indian staff corps, and the actuaries have calculated that it will amount to 95 subalterns per annum at an average age of 24 years. That is one large outlet for young officers which exists now.

2509. And has been for some time?—Yes, for some few years past. Then my next proposal is that captains should be allowed to go to the militia after say 15 years' service, and I would give them half pay for 10 years, provided they served that time in the militia. It is proposed that one fourth of the vacancies in the militia should be given in that way to captains, and the calculation of the actuaries is, that it will give 39 steps annually to the captains' rank. I think the militia would not and ought not to object to it, as they have already the power of sending a large number of subalterns from the militia into the line.

2510. When you say that the actuaries calculate 39, you mean that there would be 39 vacancies which those captains might take?—Yes.

2511. But it is surmise as to whether they would take them or not, is it not?—Quite so.

2512. The calculation on which you are proceeding, as I understand, is a calculation of the number of vacancies which would be open, or might under your proposal be open, to captains in the army to take?—Yes.

2513. But whether they would take them or not is an open question?—Yes.

2514. Upon that question is there not a rule of that sort now in existence?—I believe there is.

2515. Are you aware that it is said that captains do not take them?—It is possible that they may not take them fully at present, because the militia do not like receiving officers as a rule, except of their own counties. But the localization scheme will make this more popular, because when the line regiments get really county ties, as I anticipate, then a time will arrive when the captains of the militia and the captains of the line will both belong to the county, and therefore those facilities of going into the militla will be more eagerly accepted and would become more popular.

2516. Still that is merely problematical?—Yes, that is problematical. Then I think that it would be a great advantage to the army if the appointments of officers to the police, the constabulary, jails, and to paymasterships, were given to the younger ranks, instead of as at present being a matter of patronage. I think when a vacancy occurs in, say, the county constabulary, it should be a matter of application to the War Department to find an efficient officer. Then, again, it would be a good plan if captains of the army were allowed to join the commissariat, and the Ordnance Store Departments in the relative position of captain, and to abolish the junior grade in those two branches, and replace it by warrant officers from the ranks. Let officers join as deputy commissaries, and the junior rank be replaced by non-commissioned officers of the army with warrant rank. That would be very popular with the army. It would facilitate recruiting, would be cheaper, and we should get more efficiency.

2517. Then the outlets, speaking of captains and subalterns, are three. First of all there is the Indian staff corps, and then there is the militia. Both of those outlets exist now?—Yes.

2518. And your third is a proposal that what may be called semi-civil offices, such as the police and the constabulary, and also the departments, such as the commissariat and store, should be filled, more or less, by subaltern officers?—Yes, or rather by captains; it is one of the outlets.

2519. We have had a calculation by actuaries put before us, under which it appears that, allowing for the existing outlets, and allowing for a rigid application without exception, of the five years' rule, there will be the number that I am going to point out to you in the different ranks who must be retired or got rid of somehow in order to sustain the old flow of promotion that existed under the purchase system. For instance, there will be 29 lieutenant-colonels to be got rid of; there will be 33 majors to be got rid of, 73 captains and 29 subalterns in the course of the year, in order to sustain the old flow of promotion; that is to say, after allowing for the rigid application of the five years' rule, both with regard to lieutenant-colonels and majors, after allowing for the outlet into the militia of the captains, and after allowing for the staff corps as regards the subalterns, which is a large number, what you propose, as I understand it, is to deal entirely with that number by means of the outlet which you would create in the rank of lieutenant-colonel?—That would be partly remedied by the way in which I relieve the list of lieutenant-colonels.

2520. No doubt that would be so as between majors, colonels, and captains. A certain number of men who now would be captains would be majors, but that would not affect the flow of promotion below?—It is quite undoubted that you must have compulsory retirement at the top.

2521. The question is, whether that would be sufficient to create the proper flow of promotion, unless you carried matters so far that a man would not hold the position of lieutenant-colonel in a regiment, except for so short a time as to be quite an impossible system. Let me call your attention to this. Under the purchase system the number who left the army in the lower ranks was very large indeed, much larger in proportion than that of those in the higher ranks, and so that flow of promotion was largely created by those who went out in that way, and the difficulty of the problem seems to consist in knowing how one is to replace them?—I do not think it is at all to be taken for granted that the officers who used to retire under those circumstances will cease to do so now. They got nothing formerly for retirement except their own money back again, and as they now will pay no money they will get no money.

2522. They got their non-purchase commissions, which was about one third?—They got, I believe, 100*l.* for every year.

2523. 100*l.* for every year of foreign service, and 50*l.* for every year of home service?—Yes.

2524. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Do many young men go out of the artillery when they once come in?—They have not the chance.

2525. If they wish to go without anything might they not go; that would be an analogous case?—Of course if they would retire; but I do not think it is quite an analogous case, because the royal artillery, as a rule, are men who have not so much means as the rest of the army.

2526. We are told now it is men without means who are going into the line who used to apply to get into the artillery, because there was no purchase, and now they are wanting to get into the line because there is no purchase in preference to the artillery?—I believe that the men who go into the line now have more money than they ever had, and the artillery the same.

2527. So far as experience goes, your notion that young men will go because they wish to go, without a sum of money in hand, is not confirmed by what has been the case in the artillery up to now?—I do not know that it has.

2528. (*Chairman.*) They were to some extent a different class; the artillery was a class of men who were not, as a rule, so well off, and who had to undergo considerable study, which they had not to do in the line?—Quite so.

2529. But men of independent means who cared less about the army, and used to go into the line, would be the men who would be more likely to retire?—Yes, and there will be a large proportion of them in the army in the future.

2530. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I think you will admit that one cause why officers who formerly sought the artillery now flock into the line is because the age at which they are admitted into the line is much less, and that the examinations for entry into the line are very much less than they have to undergo if they go

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

into the artillery ?—The artillery is much sought after at the present moment. The cadets get their commissions rather later and they have a much harder examination, but still the competition is so great in this country, that whether for the army or the artillery there are a great many more candidates than there are vacancies.

2531. (*Chairman.*) Following out your scheme in another aspect with regard to the efficiency of the regiment in the field, have you any reason to suppose that a regiment would be more efficient before the enemy with five majors and six captains than it would be with the present organisation ?—In my opinion it would be more efficient with the majors mounted, and a small reduction of the junior ranks would do no harm. I think that we are rather over-officered in the junior ranks, and that is one great difficulty in the promotion question.

2532. Has not the introduction of the present arms of precision rendered rather a larger number of officers necessary than used to be sufficient ?—I do not think so. The royal artillery are not supposed to be inefficient as a body, and they have fewer officers than the other branches of the service.

2533. Is it a fact, you think, that you can argue from the management of a battery of artillery in the field as to the management of a battalion of a regiment, or the double company of a regiment ?—I think so. The duties of the artillery at all times are very onerous to the officers, because they have so many men, horses, guns, carriages, ammunition, harness, and details to look after, and therefore, if they can efficiently work in the field with comparatively a few officers, I think that the others can do the same, and in my opinion the loss of a few of the younger officers to the line would not hurt them.

2534. You do not look upon it, as I understand, that there are really too many now, but you think that some few might be taken off without any very serious injury ?—I think that the younger officers are rather in excess.

2535. In any operations in the field now there would be more mortality amongst the officers than there used to be, would there not ?—I think not.

2536. Another suggestion has been made to us, namely, that if you convert five captains or four captains into mounted officers, and so field officers, and give them higher position and grade, they would be unwilling to do many of those purely regimental duties with the assiduity with which they now perform them, as being beneath the grade that they occupy ?—I do not attach any importance to that.

2537. You do not think that that would be the case ?—No, I do not.

2538. Now let me take you to another branch of this subject, I mean the system of brevet promotion ; that we are told creates some anomalies, but has some merits ; what upon the whole is your opinion of the system of brevet promotion for distinguished service, is it one which ought to be maintained ?—I think there are some anomalies in brevet, but on the whole the advantages outweigh the anomalies.

2539. What are the advantages, as you understand them ?—The advantages are that you are able rapidly to bring on distinguished officers in the field.

2540. That might be done by at once giving them substantive promotion, might it not ?—There are no vacancies for substantive promotion, or if you promoted them to the unattached list the officers would suddenly cease to have duties at the very time that you wanted them.

2541. There probably would be vacancies if the Commander-in-Chief had the whole infantry to select from ?—I do not think there would be substantive vacancies to promote a large number of officers into, in time of war.

2542. That brings one to another question, what sort of service do you think ought to command this special promotion by brevet ?—I think that it should be really distinguished service, and that it should be given much more sparingly than it has been for years past.

2543. Is there any system that occurs to you by which you could draw the line in order to carry out that idea of stopping the unnecessary and lavish distribution of it ?—I think it entirely rests with the authorities not to give it except in rare cases.

2544. The mere fact of having served before the enemy in the course of military duty without any special and abnormal distinction ought not, you think, to give a claim to brevet ?—No, not unless it was arduous and distinguished service.

2545. Such service would be comparatively rare, would it not ?—Rarer than the manner in which brevets have been given of late years. I think that the army generally would like to see brevets more sparingly distributed.

2546. Will any other system act efficiently, do you think, by way of reward in the place of brevet ?—No, I do not see any other.

2547. A good service pension and decorations have been talked of, what is your opinion of that ?—I do not approve of them, because they do not achieve the object, which is to give a comparatively young man a rapid rise in the army, not only as a reward for himself, but for the good of the service.

2548. No other system would achieve that double object ?—No, except substantive rank ; but as I say I do not see there is a possibility of substantive rank. There would not be vacancies.

2549. The brevet system is one which does not obtain in foreign armies, I believe ?—I fancy not.

2550. And you think it advisable to retain it ?—I think it has its advantages, if carefully used.

2551. With regard to the staff, it has been said that it is desirable for the sake of the army generally, and to spread as greatly as possible the experience of his profession which a man obtains by serving on the staff, that officers should not very frequently be reappointed who have served their five years on the staff, what do you think of that ?—I think that the five years' rule is a very good one, and should be adhered to, especially in the lower ranks.

2552. Up to what rank would you go in that remark ?—As high as major. There are cases in the higher ranks possibly where very experienced or distinguished men might with advantage be retained longer, but the rule is a very good one to be occasionally broken.

2553. The occasions of breaking it being the exception and not the rule ?—The exception certainly, and entirely done for the good of the public service.

2554. Do you think that passing the staff College is a thing which ought to be a condition precedent to obtaining the lower appointments on the staff ?—I think that it should give an officer a certain claim, but not a right, and I would not give all the staff appointments to Staff College men.

2555. Do you think then that some regimental officers would be quite as well fitted for the staff, without passing the Staff College, as those who have had the acquirements which that institution confers ?—That Institution confers advantages on young officers, but the wide field of experience of the army generally is in my opinion the best school for making staff officers.

2556. I understand that the special capacity which you should seek for in a staff officer is not to be found in mere intellectual acquirement ?—No, not altogether.

2557. So that you may find specially capable men in the ranks of the army who have not gone through those special studies ?—Certainly I should prefer a staff officer who had a wide experience, we will say of different countries, or a little active service, to one who had merely proved himself a good scholar.

2558. Would that remark apply also to officers in the army generally, speaking now of their efficiency as regimental officers ; do you think that intellectual acquirement is the only thing or the main thing that you would look for as qualifying a man for regimental efficiency ?—I think that the examinations that are

now instituted for entrance to the army are good, and the examinations that officers have to pass through before they receive the step of promotion are also desirable.

2559. What do you think of the competitive system?—I think the competitive system is advantageous in that it ensures our getting better educated men to enter the army; but as you are aware there are three ways now of entering the army—1, competition; 2, from the universities; and 3, from the militia.

2560. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) There is another mode which you have forgotten, namely, the Indian and Queen's cadets, who enter by a test examination?—Yes, and officers also are appointed from the ranks.

2561. (*Chairman.*) You are well aware that there has been from time to time, owing to the different organization of the artillery from that which obtains in the line, a supersession of the one arm of the service over the other in the general ranks of the army; that is an undesirable thing, is it not?—The royal artillery as a rule have been superseded by all branches of the army in every rank, and that is a very undesirable thing to retain.

2562. Latterly the balance has been turned the other way, has it not?—Not at all. If you will allow me I will give you an illustration. The artillery majors who were created in July 1872 are stated to have superseded the line. Those majors were made chiefly on account of the importance of their duties, and partly with a view to assist promotion by a readjustment of ranks. The junior captain of the royal artillery and the royal engineers made a major in July 1872, had 16 years and 4 months' service. I find that of the cavalry majors serving on that date with regiments, one obtained his majority in 8 years and 9 months; and 34 majors of cavalry who were then serving, obtained their majorities under 16 years and 4 months, out of a total of 48 majors. Of the infantry majors serving in July 1872, one had obtained his majority in 6 years and 5 months, and 87 of them had obtained their majorities under 16 years and 4 months, out of a total of 283 majors. Therefore there was nothing very remarkable in the junior captain of the artillery and engineers who was made a major becoming so in 16 years and 4 months, although he superseded a considerable number of old captains of the infantry. I imagine that the major of the infantry who obtained his majority in 6 years and 5 months, must have superseded a vastly larger number. I have also calculated the average service of the whole of the lieutenant-colonels and majors, and of the junior captains of cavalry, infantry, and artillery, who were then serving (July 1872), on obtaining that rank, and it is as follows:—lieutenant-colonel of the cavalry, 19 years and 7 months, of infantry 23 years and 2 months, and of the artillery 23 years.

2563. This is the average number of years which a lieutenant-colonel had served when he became lieutenant-colonel?—Yes; again: Majors of the cavalry, 15 years and 3 months; infantry, 18 years and 4 months; artillery, 21 years and 2 months; junior captains,—captain of cavalry, 8 years and 3 months; infantry, 9 years and 10 months; and artillery, 12 years and 9 months.

2564. Does this figure for the majors of 21 years and 2 months include those men whom Lord Cardwell, you say, gave the step of major to?—Yes; the average on being made major was 21 years 2 months in July 1872.

2565. That is an average which was taken in the previous period, was it not?—No, there were no majors before. I took all the first captains who were made majors, and added their services together, and then divided them, which gives an average of 21 years and 2 months.

2566. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) It is very much the same with the engineers, is it not?—Yes. Now take January 1875,—the average service of the three arms is as follows—Lieutenant-colonel of the cavalry, on attaining the rank, 21 years and 3 months; infantry, 23 years and 9 months. I find that the lieutenant-colonel of the artillery last promoted served 24 years and 10 months before he got to that rank.

2567. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Does that include Indians?—That is the old royal artillery. It does not include the Indian artillery. I left them out because the Indian Government have given some exceptional promotions in those cadres lately. The majors in the cavalry served 14 years and 10 months, and the infantry, 19 years and 1 month, and the major of the artillery last promoted in January 1875, was 19 years and 8 months in attaining that rank.

2568. (*Chairman.*) You say that in January 1875, the lieutenant-colonels in the cavalry had served 21 years and 3 months?—On the average.

2569. Does that mean that you took the existing lieutenant-colonels of cavalry, and then inquired how many years each of them served before they obtained their lieutenant-colonelcy?—Yes.

2570. And you then reduced them to an average?—Yes.

2571. That is the way you have calculated it?—Yes, and the same with the infantry.

2572. When you came to the artillery you have not done the same, but you say you took the junior lieutenant-colonel; he may not although he is junior lieutenant-colonel have served so long, or he may have served longer than some one who became lieutenant-colonel before him?—Then in order to make the matter clear I will give both the average in the artillery, and also the length of service of the lieutenant-colonel last promoted, as follows:—The average service of all lieutenant-colonels of old royal artillery, serving in January 1875, on attaining that rank, was 23 years and five months; and the lieutenant-colonel last promoted had a service of 24 years and 10 months. I wish to point out that whilst among the regiments of cavalry and infantry there are constant variations in the period of attaining promotion, it is not so in the royal artillery among men of the same standing; they all rise up in this large regiment, and it now takes them nearly 25 years to become lieutenant-colonels. I think the figures that I have given show that the royal artillery appear to be suffering from supersession.

2573. What would be your view of the mode of avoiding that, because where there is supersession by the line over the artillery, or *vice versâ* it is an undesirable thing?—I would arrange the proportion of ranks and the outlets to the various services very much on the same principles, and my proposals are, as it were, to improve the proportions of the ranks in the infantry and cavalry so as to adjust them to those new arrangements of the royal artillery.

2574. You think that if something like an approach was made in the line to the organization of the artillery, that would be found to equalize the rate of promotion, so as to avoid supersession?—Quite so. But there is another fact, which is this, that even the present organization of the royal artillery is not altgether satisfactory, because the actuaries calculate that it will take upwards of 20 years for an officer of the royal artillery to become a major, even with the improved organization.

2575. And how long would it take for him to become a colonel?—They are lieutenant-colonels first, and then full colonels. I cannot state that exactly.

2576. With regard to the present system of retirement in the artillery, the retirements in the artillery are given after a certain number of years' service, are they not?—There is one retirement now practically in the artillery, which is after 30 years' service.

2577. Has that always been the case?—Since 1854.

2578. Is that power of retirement independent of numbers, or is it restricted by a fixed sum?—Restricted by a fixed sum after 30 years' service.

2579. Is there any retirement in the ranks below that?—There is the retirement of lieutenant-colonels on full pay after 30 years' service, but none below.

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

2580. Thirty years' service?—Half pay also after 25 years' service.

2581. Are those retirements accepted?—The retirements generally have been accepted, but latterly not entirely so; and there is a cause, namely, that our colonels now are abnormally young, owing to the great augmentations in consequence of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, so that the colonels have run up the list quickly. The colonels now are younger than they have ever been, and some are of 48 or 49 years of age; those men do not care about retiring, because they are not from age anxious to do so; they find that the emoluments of a full colonel in employment are much larger than 600*l.*

2582. What are they?—The appointment of a colonel of artillery on the staff may be considered to be worth 1,000*l.* a year, taking his house, forage, pay, and allowances.

2583. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) When you refer to the colonel on the staff, what do you mean by that?—The full colonel commanding the royal artillery in a large military district.

2584. What has he under his command; does he command really a regiment?—He has all the batteries in that district under his command, horse, field, or garrison artillery, and lieutenant-colonels under him.

2585. It is almost the same as in the line doing he duties of major-general?—Yes, or rather of a brigadier general.

2586. (*Chairman.*) What is the lieutenant-colonel's retirement?—Full pay after 30 years' service.

2587. Are those accepted?—No, not very often, because when they see that a full colonel of 30 years' service can retire upon 600*l.* they naturally do not care about taking 400*l.* But my view is that in the royal artillery the scale of retirement should be very much that of the rest of the army. Whatever you lay down for one you should lay down for the other.

2588. You stated I think that the creation of those captains into majors was a new step. Used there not to be majors in the artillery?—Many years ago.

2589. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Were there not majors in the artillery 40 years ago?—There were majors in the artillery before 1826, and they were made lieutenant-colonels.

2590. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) And was that with the view of redressing some supersession of rank in comparison with the line, or why do you think that was done?—I think it was, but I do not quite remember the cause. As a rule the artillery have suffered under supersession in every rank for many years.

2591. (*Chairman.*) Do you consider that even now with the lifts which has been given them lately, they still do not stand so well as the line in that respect?—No, they do not stand quite so well as the line.

2592. (*Lord Hampton.*) Have you always served in the artillery?—Yes.

2593. Have you ever served with the line regiments in the field?—Certainly, in the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny.

2594. Not in command of the line?—No, I was on the staff as assistant adjutant-general.

2595. I was struck by the opinion which you gave us that there are too many young officers in every line regiment. In the course of the evidence which we have received we have had very strong statements of an opposite tendency, that there were much too few subaltern officers in the line; may I ask your reason for thinking that there are too many young officers in a line regiment?—I think that the success of a regiment in the field depends chiefly on the field officers, and officers of experience, and upon the senior non-commissioned officers, but I do not think that the young subalterns lend really much weight to a regiment on active service; they are very gallant and fine young fellows, but I think that it is to the superior officers that we must trust for leading a regiment successfully.

2596. I think I understand your general view as to brevet is, that you would retain it, but greatly reduce the application of it?—Quite so.

2597. You made some reference in your evidence to the regimental reports with regard to officers, and I think you also alluded to other reports which came in when circumstances rendered them necessary, what reports did you refer to in those words?—In the case of occasional misconduct of an officer, the general officers would not wait for the confidential report, but as a matter of course they would bring his conduct to the notice of the Commander-in-Chief at any time, and therefore he has ample means at all times of knowing the characters of officers, and if he wants information has equally the power of course of getting it.

2598. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Do you think that pure seniority promotion in your regiment works satisfactorily, as regards the officers with relation to their military character, or would you like to see, if it could be managed, something like selection for those who are most promising?—I should very much like to see selection and I should very much like to see inequality in the rapidity of promotion, but the Royal Artillery is one large service on one list, and therefore I do not see my way now to either one or the other.

2599. Seniority is rather a refuge from difficulties than really in the abstract the best thing that could be devised?—Quite so; instead of creating a number of regiments of artillery one after the other as augmentations have taken place, they have added to the one regiment until it has become a service, and no longer a regiment.

2600. Do you think that the bare seniority system upon which the promotion is conducted in the artillery has any effect in dulling the aspirations and energies particularly of the young men in the service?—I do not think it is a good thing. it deprives any officer, however distinguished, of the hope of ever becoming an artillery officer of high rank as a young man.

2601. Therefore, it would be very undesirable, as far as you can judge from your experience, that anything like that system should now become the rule in the army generally?—Yes, I approve of selection if carefully carried out.

2602. Do you think it so advantageous a thing for the service at large, that if you could see your way to it you would even like to see it in the artillery?—Yes.

2603. The artillery is so situated that you do not see your way to it?—I do not.

2604. I understood you to say that at one time you had been of opinion that it was desirable to retire young men early in their period of service from the army, but that you have changed your opinion; can you state shortly what your reasons were for that opinion and why you have changed it?—In my evidence before what is called Mr. Childers' committee, I gave evidence in favour of a graduated scale of pensions, gradually rising through all grades of the service.

2605. (*Chairman.*) Was it a scale that went down tolerably low?—Yes, it went down low and rose by steps. At that time that was my opinion of the best way of obtaining promotion, but having had several years more experience now, especially in this office, I see that it would be much better to spend the money by improving the position of officers in the regiment and in the alteration of ranks and increasing the upper ranks, and I think it is more satisfactory to the officers and is cheaper than the other system. Therefore, I would limit, as far as possible, the retirements to the higher ranks; the actuaries have tended to convince me by their evidence, especially that before Mr. Vivian's committee of 1870, that my former views were so far wrong that they were very costly.

2606. They convinced you that they could get the same rate of promotion through the upper ranks at a less price than if the money were applied, or a portion of it, to the lower ranks?—If the money were applied *in toto* on a graduated scale.

2607. That graduated scale includes the upper and the lower?—Yes.

2608. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) The temptation, if it is a temptation, to be applied at the top instead of over all the ranks of the service?—Yes, coupled with a re-adjustment of the ranks.

2609. (*Chairman.*) You say that you are convinced that the same sum of money, or a less sum of money, would create the same flow of promotion?—Yes.

2610. That is what your opinion is based upon?—Yes. The evidence of the actuaries before Mr. Vivian's committee is clear to that effect.

2611. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Then for that re-adjustment you depend principally upon making double companies and squadrons, and so reducing the number of junior officers who enter the service?—Yes.

2612. Has it occurred to you that when you suggest that the War Office should recommend officers in the junior ranks for employment as chief constables of counties and so forth, and for the command of jails, that it would practically take out of the service probably all the most promising men if they are called upon to recommend very efficient ones for such responsible posts as that, and that it might be an injury to the service; has that suggestion occurred to you?—Yes, there is some force in that; but it would only take some, and it is so necessary to make outlets on account of the great number of young officers, that I still think it would be advantageous.

2613. It would not do to leave the army with all the bad bargains in the service and take the good ones out for other employment?—No.

2614. That is one of the reasons which we have had very forcibly suggested to us why we should not give a very large option to young officers to retire?—Yes, I am against giving money for that reason.

2615. I suppose you have given your attention to the general effect of the recent changes with regard to the abolition of purchase and so forth in the army; do you think that the effect of it has been to bring a class of men into the army who are likely to make that profession a more studied profession than has hitherto been the case?—I think at all events they are better educated when they come into it, and probably they will study it more whilst they are in it.

2616. Do you think they are a class who will make more a profession of it instead of being a class who in a large proportion come in for a short time, meaning to follow other more tempting pursuits in after life, would it become more a pure profession than heretofore?—I do not know that it will become more purely a profession except that the officers will study more their profession whilst they remain if they are obliged to do it.

2617. In the artillery and the engineers it has always been more purely a profession?—Yes.

2618. Is that partly due to the fact that perhaps those gentlemen entering, although they may be from the same class of life, were not so well endowed with worldly goods and the entrance to those corps at that time being without purchase?—Perhaps so.

2619. To that extent if the army now is entered without purchase it will operate to a considerable extent in making it a more purely professional life than heretofore?—I do not know that it will; I think that the army will continue to attract rich men and poor men as before, only they are coming in now better educated.

2620. No doubt you think it desirable that the mixture of the different classes and ranks should be maintained?—Certainly.

2621. In the Crimea did you come in contact with officers of the French army at all in a general way socially and so forth?—Yes.

2622. Did you find that there was a broad line of demarcation between officers who had risen from the ranks and those who were of a better class of life?—Yes.

2623. And that they did not mix much together?—No, I do not think they did.

2624. I suppose gentlemen in the British army did not much mix with officers who were of the class who had risen from the ranks generally, there was not much accord between them?—I do not know that in active service we had much means of judging of those things, but we were very cordial with all of them, we had not sufficient social intercourse in active service to be able to draw distinctions for ourselves.

2625. Do you think that officers who had risen from the ranks in the French army had the same authority and weight with their own men as our officers had?—No, perhaps not, partly from the want of education.

2626. (*Chairman.*) You stated that you were convinced by the actuaries who gave evidence before Mr. Vivian's commission that the system of the retiring of officers from the lower ranks was not a desirable one, for that the same result could be produced cheaper by retiring from the upper ranks?—Yes, partly by the evidence of the actuaries.

2627. I find this passage in the report, "As regards "allowing voluntary retirements from the lower ranks "we think that a limited number of captains, second "captains, and lieutenants with over 10 years' service "might be allowed to retire annually, on a rate of "pension to be fixed according to their rank without "reference to length of service. The retirements "from these ranks should be offered to captains, "second captains, and lieutenants, in equal numbers, "and to the seniors of each rank in succession so far "as the funds would allow." I gather from that that the Commission recommended retirement from the lower ranks after not less than 10 years' service; it appears from this report that the Commissioners did not take that view of the actuaries' evidence?—I think they were alluding to an exceptional abnormal state of affairs. I think they advocated 5,000*l.* a year as a temporary measure.

2628. It is not stated at all to be a temporary thing, they seem to have recommended retirements from the lower ranks, those retirements to be restricted to a limited sum?—Yes, it appears that it is so. It was not the report (which I did not quite agree to), but it was the view of the actuaries as given in their evidence which influenced me.

2629. It has been suggested to us that it would be a great benefit, if promotion where it went by seniority in the line and in the army generally should not go by regimental seniority but should go by seniority in the whole army; the tendency of that system would be of course to equalize promotion very much more in each of the separate regiments. I gather from your previous remarks that you would not think that at all desirable?—No, I do not.

2630. You think it would be a mischief?—Yes, I think it would be a mischief.

2631. Because the irregular action of promotion of the different regiments has the effect of bringing up practically a number of young men?—Quite so. I think also it would injure the regimental *esprit*. Therefore you would be against it?—Yes, I should.

2632. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) To revert to what you said just now about retirement in the artillery, are you aware that the retirement in the artillery is chiefly from the upper ranks?—Yes.

2633. And yet you say that the promotion is unsatisfactory in the artillery; how do you reconcile that with the opinion which you expressed just now that the inducements to retire should be kept to the upper ranks and that it would be a cheaper system?—There is no compulsory retirement at present in the Royal Artillery, and I think there ought to be as in the rest of the army, only in the higher ranks.

2634. Do you think that even with compulsory retirement sufficient flow could be induced in an enormous body such as the artillery, as to insure an adequate promotion amongst the junior ranks?—I think so, coupled with the readjustment of the ranks that has taken place already and assisted by the outlets which I propose to grant for the future to the juniors.

2635. You said just now that the actuaries look forward to even a worse prospect of promotion for the artillery than they have hitherto had?—No, I said

Brig.-Gen. Sir J. M. Adye, K.C.B., R.A.

3 May 1875.

that the actuaries point out that it will take on the present organization of the artillery 20 years to become a major, and the normal is 18; therefore, we are not very far off it.

2636. Do not you think that lateral inducements to go, that is retirements in the lower ranks, would increase that promotion which is so desirable?—I do not entirely set my face against that, but I should be very cautious how I spent money in the lower ranks for retirement.

2637. Your objection being as I gather that you by such means lead valuable officers to go who would otherwise not go?—At all events you would lead young men to go into idleness with pensions, whereas I want the old ones to go.

2638. What would certainly follow would be that the whole of our artillery regiments would be officered by old officers?—No, on the present organization, as I have said, with the present money for retirements, the juniors become majors in 20 years, and we want a little improvement upon that—not very much money.

2639. Talking about retirements they should be the same for the artillery as for the rest of the army, or rather they should all be alike; you stated that nobody got the rank of colonel in the artillery under 30 years' service. I take up the army list for the 1st January 1875, and I find 11 colonels of the Royal Artillery, old list, attained the rank under 30 years' service?—That would be very abnormal; but there are a few colonels, who, owing to the great augmentations of the regiment from nine brigades in 1846 to 17 brigades in 1870, obtained very quick promotion; but that will not occur again, it is quite unusual.

2640. You advocate, as an improvement in the line, that we should have the organization of the double companies with majors commanding them?—Yes.

2641. Do you know that this system has been objected to, or is very likely to be modified in Germany in consequence of the majors being unable, in the very extended lines that the double company now forms, to command them efficiently, as he would have to be on foot when they came into close quarters?—I have heard that said.

2642. That would be an objection, would it not?—It shows that they might think it so, if they do carry out what you suppose; but I am not quite sure that they are going to carry it out.

2643. It is a moot question in Germany, as you are aware, whether their double companies are not a mistake, as we have it in evidence from General Walker?—That may be.

2644. You propose no really adequate retirement, that is, full pay retirement, till a man has served for 30 years. Do you think it is desirable that a major should really do captain's work up to 30 years of service or 50 years of age. Do you not think that he would get very tired and do it in a very perfunctory and slovenly sort of manner?—He would have large command much earlier in life by my proposal than he would have it under the present organization. He would become a major and a mounted officer with command of a large body of men years before he would become a major under the present organization, whilst under the present organization the major has very little to do.

2645. At what period would a man arrive at the rank of major under your proposed organization?—I cannot say exactly, but it is quite evident that he would arrive at it many years before he would under the present organization.

2646. At any rate you propose that he shall not be able to retire until he had had 30 years' service; of course you may allow him to retire earlier, but he would not be quit of it until he has had 30 years' service, and it is not desirable that a man should remain until that time of life in command of that comparatively unimportant number? I propose to look into that question of the majors, and if I may be allowed, to give some further evidence upon that point.

2647. Following up Lord Hampton's questions just now, you feel satisfied from your own experience that the regimental work could be carried on in the field with fewer officers than at present. Has your experience been of that nature that it would permit of your speaking of this with confidence and authority?—I think so, because judging by long experience in the Royal Artillery I find that we work with fewer officers than the line; a cavalry regiment has a lieutenant-colonel, a major, eight captains, and 10 lieutenants, and some sub-lieutenants, with an adjutant, paymaster, riding master and quartermaster, besides non-combatant officers for about 384 horses, whereas a battery has only five officers with say 150 men and 150 horses, guns, carriages, harness, ammunition, and stores. I find by the estimates that the number of officers in the whole of the cavalry are 558 out of a total of 11,643 of all ranks. In the artillery there are 706 officers out of 19,602 of all ranks. Therefore, the proportions of artillery officers as compared with the men are less than those of the cavalry.

2648. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Have you looked at the Indian establishment of cavalry?—No, I have taken the regiments at home and the artillery at home.

2649. (*Mr. Welby.*) You were saying that you proposed to throw open the Control Department as a relief to the regular army with the view of getting men to go out, you were proposing that I suppose as a means of creating vacancies without a particular consideration to whether it was desirable to confer certain special appointments on military men; you are only looking at it from that point of view as a relief in the higher promotions, in proposing that the Governors of jails and officers of that kind should be officers retired from the army?—No, I think on both grounds it would be desirable that the Commissariat and the Ordnance Store Departments should be officered by military men.

2650. I see that the pay of the Control Department taking the average, is somewhat higher than that of a captain, that is to say, a Departmental officer who ranks with a captain is a little bit higher, thefore I suppose under your plan if a captain retired he would simply go on the effective strength of the Control Department receiving no retired pay as a combatant officer?—He would not retire, he would be transferred into one of the two Departments which I have named.

2651. But the non-effective estimate of the combatant officers would not bear any charge upon his account?—His service as a combatant officer of course would count towards his ultimate pension in joining the Commissariat or Ordnance Store Department.

2652. But while a man was on the general commissariat staff he would not draw any pay of any sort or kind as a combatant officer?—He would become a *bonâ fide* commissariat officer.

2653. I think if you will look at the estimate you will see that the commissary officers number about 200, and their pay is about 72,000 a year, if the whole of those officers you were to consider as officers withdrawn from the combatant army you would in reality have provided a retirement to almost that amount without adding to the charge of the army estimates?—I would rather say an outlet, not retirement; certainly that would be so.

2654. Therefore, it would be a considerable relief to any increased charge which might be caused by the necessity of creating promotion?—Quite so, and I believe that the highest military authorities will be entirely in accord with me in that proposition, that captains from the army would make very efficient commissariat and Ordnance store officers; and that by having the lowest grade of those two departments filled by warrant officers promoted from the ranks who would not look to further promotion, it would be a very economical measure and a very good thing for recruiting.

2655. In fact for the 200 civilian officers that there are at present would be replaced by 200 military men?—Yes, gradually, as vacancies arose.

2656. You proposed that the captains after 15 years' service should go into the militia for 10 years, what was to become of them after that time, would they lose their pension?—Yes; they would have half-pay, only for the 10 years.

2657. From that time they would be no charge upon the country on their account?—No, none at all. They would be country gentlemen, and it would be an inducement to officers who serve in the army to rejoin the militia of their counties; and I would give them half-pay after 15 years service for 10 years to induce them to do so.

2658. Of course you are only contemplating men of means going out of the army by that outlet?—There are many men of means in the army and it would be an inducement to them to serve in the militia of their counties.

2659. I think you said that you would look further into the question of what the effect of increasing the number of majors would be in acclerating promotion amongst the captains?—Yes, I will do so.

2660. Might I call your attention to this point—It appears to me that that would very likely shorten the service of captains by something like four or five years. There are now 10 captains and two majors in each regiment, under your plan there would be six captains and five majors; the ordinary average length of service as we have ascertained for captains is 10 years, and I think also calculating that would show that the average length of service of a captain under your plan would be five or six years less?—Quite so; therefore, at all events I benefit the captains considerably without costing anything to the State. My scale shows no extra cost.

2661. (*Chairman.*) You would do it without charge to the estimates because part of your plan is to suppress three officers?—Yes, three junior officers.

2662. (*Mr. Welby.*) Still a captain would become a major some four years or five years earlier than he now does?—Yes.

2663. (*Lord Hampton.*) Are you of opinion that it would be an advantage if the officers of the British army had more opportunities for their professional education than they now receive?—I think they have already sufficient means of education. I think it is a very good thing to have the means of education as at present in the Staff College and examinations and other means of instruction, but I look upon it that officers are made efficient a great deal more by the wide experience they have with the British army than anything else. I believe that in consequence the staff officers of the British army are better than any staff officers in the world, from the varied experience gained by the extended nature of our dominion.

2664. And you do not think that the officers in our army would be able to benefit more by that experience if they combined it with a more extensive professional education?—I think the present means are sufficient.

2665. Should I be correct in describing the education which is given to the artillery at Woolwich as combining both technical and professional instruction. Your training at Woolwich I presume would admit of that distinction, would it not?—Yes.

2666. Is it your opinion, speaking generally of the officers of the Royal Artillery that they are better officers and derive great advantage from their professional training at the college as distinguished from the technical training?—Certainly, I think they derive great advantage from their professional training at the college.

2667. And why should not officers of the line in like manner derive advantage from professional training if a military college was established for all branches?—I see no objection to that. I thought you were alluding to education after entering the army. The cadets at Woolwich are educated professionally before they enter the army which is a very good thing.

2668. (*Maj-Gen. Foster.*) I presume it is your opinion that the army in time of peace ought to be fit to take the field at a moment's notice?—Certainly.

2669. Might not a system of retirement which only removed an officer when he became too old for his employment bring the army almost to the verge of inefficiency, because if an army took the field the lieutenant-colonel might have half a year to serve before he becomes inefficient from age should he have to take the field with only a half year's service before him?—I think that an army of which the oldest lieutenant-colonel must be under 55 would be a very efficient one, and I should doubt if any army in Europe would have such young officers.

2670. Are you aware of what the cadre of a cavalry regiment consisted in 1844 out in India?—I do not remember.

2671. There were two lieutenant-colonels, two majors, nine captains, and 29 subalterns, total 40 officers, and there were about 600 men, and that cadre was found insufficient for the requirements of the service, on service?—I do not remember how that was. I have no doubt that the facts as to numbers are correct, but whether they proved insufficient for service I cannot say. I never heard before that they were insufficient for service.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday next at 12 o'clock.

2672. P.S. Since giving my evidence I have considered further the question of the majors and captains, and would propose as follows in addition to my other recommendations.

Majors should be ineligible for promotion after 50 years of age. They should have optional retirement after 30 years' service on full pay, and they should be compulsorily retired at 53 on full pay. Captains to be ineligible for promotion after 47; they may retire after 25 years' service on 200*l.* per annum, and must retire at 50 years of age on 250*l.*

7th May 1875. JOHN ADYE, B.G.

War Office, Pall Mall, Thursday, 6th May 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Captain WILLIAM COOKE examined.

Captain William Cooke.
6th May 1875.

2673. (*Chairman.*) Your rank in the army is that of captain?—Yes.

2674. In what regiment?—The 22nd regiment.

2675. Are you at present employed in the Topographical Department?—Yes.

2676. How many years' service have you?—A little under 15 years.

2677. Are we right in supposing that you have passed through the Staff College?—Yes.

2678. How long were you there?—Two years.

2679. On leaving what certificate did you obtain?—No special certificate was given to the officers on passing the final examination.

2680. Did you pass an examination?—Yes, I was classified on the examination list according to the number of marks that I obtained.

2681. What was your position in the classification? Was it a high one?—Either sixth or seventh; I do not remember which. I left in 1869.

2682. We are told that there is an examination preliminary to entering the Staff College You passed that I suppose?—Yes.

2683. That is a competitive examination, is it not?—Yes.

2684. During the time when you were at the Staff College you must have had an opportunity of seeing and knowing pretty much the objects and motives of those who were being instructed there. Can you give the Commission any idea as to whether, as a rule, the object of those who attended the Staff College was their own improvement or advancement in their profession, or whether they had any collateral motives in attending there?—I think the objects which officers had in view in going to the college were various. Many men went there in order to improve themselves, some possibly to escape Indian or other foreign service, and some again to be settled for a certain time; the greater number undoubtedly with the intention of improving themselves, and attaining to the higher posts in the service.

2685. Would the majority, do you think, be of that class?—I think the majority would certainly.

2686. But still there were a considerable minority who entered the college from other collateral motives which you have alluded to?—Yes, I think so.

2687. Naturally the result is tested by the examination at the end of their educational course; but is there any system in action at the Staff College by which the industry of those who go there is secured?—Every student is compelled to attend a certain number of lectures in each subject which he takes up. If he does not attend that number, it would be brought to the notice of the commandant of the college; otherwise, with the exception of certain periodical examinations and the examination at the end of each year, there is no direct means of enforcing it.

2688. How often are the periodical examinations?—I believe they have recently been changed. When I was there we had examinations at the end of each half year, and in some branches of study at the end of each quarter, or even more frequently.

2689. If a man was found deficient at one of those quarterly examinations, what was the consequence?—There was no consequence at the quarterly examination. Whatever marks were obtained were carried on to the general total. It was only at the examination at the end of the first year that a man, if deficient, would be removed.

2690. That system was adopted, was it?—Yes, at the end of the first year, but not before the end of the first year. He would not be allowed to remain unless he then attained a certain proficiency in the obligatory subjects of study. There were always five obligatory subjects, four military subjects and one foreign language, in which a certain proficiency was required, or the officer was liable to be removed.

2691. To what extent was that acted upon. Were men removed practically?—During the time that I was in the Staff College nobody was removed, but I know cases in which men have been removed.

2692. But that would be a rare occurrence?—That would be a very rare occurrence.

2693. Do they work hard at the Staff College?—I think that depends very much upon the man's ability and inclination.

2694. Ability and volition?—Yes, exactly. It depends also a great deal upon a man's previous education. I happen myself to have been a cadet at Sandhurst, and that afforded me very great facilities. I did not find it so hard as some men did; many who had not received a previous training in surveying, military drawing, fortification, and other technical subjects of study, found it rather difficult to keep up with the rest of the students.

2695. When you entered the Staff College was there any very sharp competition to go in?—No, I should not call it a sharp competition. There was one vacancy, perhaps, for every two candidates. There were twice the number of applicants as vacancies. I think when I went up there were something like 30 candidates for the 15 vacancies.

2696. Do I understand you that the subjects in which the final examination takes place are chiefly military?—Chiefly military, but it includes also natural and experimental science, mathematics, languages, and drawing; the military subjects, however, form the principal test.

2697. It has been suggested to us that the system that was pursued in the Staff College was too profound and too elaborate an education in some of those subjects for the special useful purposes to which the education is afterwards to be directed. Is that your opinion?—No, I think not at all.

2698. You do not think that they go too high?—I think certainly not. I do not call to mind any subject in which I thought the test too high, except, perhaps, it might be in artillery.

2699. You mean that it was too high for a man who was going to the line?—Not only that, but even for a man who was going to the general staff service; otherwise in all the other subjects I do not think it is at all too high.

2700. Supposing you had your choice between two systems, one such as the present, involving a certain elaborate education and acquirements for comparatively few officers, and another, in which you could educate a larger number of officers up to a somewhat lower standard, which do you think would be the best?—If the choice lay between the two alternatives, I should prefer continuing the present system, keeping in view the requirements of the general staff.

2701. It has been suggested that a less amount of

proficiency, coupled with a knowledge of actual practical military life, would be likely to render a man more useful as a staff officer than great proficiency in the studies which are cultivated there; is there any reason, do you think, for holding that opinion?—I think if you could induce more men to go through the present staff course, it would be all the better; but I do not think that the present tests are at all too high for what is required of the general staff officer.

2702. But if you could only induce more men to go by a lower standard, what would you say to that?—I should still think that the present test ought to be applied.

2703. You would rather have a more limited number of men at the higher test?—Yes, I do not think the present test is too high for what should be required of the staff officer.

2704. But it may be too high to induce a large number to undergo it?—Scarcely even that, for there seems at the present time to be greater competition for admission to the Staff College than there was formerly.

2705. Therefore you think there is no fear on that score?—I think there is no fear of the number of candidates diminishing on that account.

2706. Would you be of opinion that having passed through the Staff College, and having gone through a successful examination there, it would be desirable to continue the system of always appointing such men to the lower positions on the staff?—Unless you afford men some inducement by giving them staff posts, they will not, I think, be inclined to subject themselves to the two years of, to many men, severe study at the college. Therefore as a means of inducing them to educate themselves in the desired manner, I should say it is essential that they should be appointed to staff posts.

2707. I suppose a good many of the lower staff posts might be held with success, might they not, by men who have not been so highly educated?—Some of the lower staff posts most undoubtedly might.

2708. It is the opinion of some that the having passed through the Staff College ought to be looked upon as something like a degree at a university, which stamps a man as having a certain proficiency in intellectual acquirement, and in this case it would be a proficiency in military acquirement, but that there it should stop, and it should not carry with it any claim to special service or promotion; would that system answer, do you think?—I think not; the bare fact of taking a degree would not be a sufficient inducement to a man to go through the Staff College unless he thereby acquired some claim, however indirect, of obtaining future employment on the staff.

2709. Do you think that the establishment of the Staff College is sufficient, or would you increase it, so as to allow a larger number of men to attend?—I think it is sufficient for all the purposes for which it is now required.

2710. (*Lord Hampton.*) Did you say that there were 15 vacancies when you were elected?—Yes, when I passed in; at the present time there are 20 vacancies annually.

2711. The total number of students at the Staff College is limited to 20, is it not?—It is limited to 40 altogether, 20 entering each year at the present time. Up to three or four years ago it was 15 each year, the total number being limited to 30.

2712. Is the system of military instruction which is given there of a general professional character, or is it limited to points which it is thought may be advantageous to an officer on the staff?—It is mainly devoted to technical subjects of military study. By this, I mean that the general system of drill does not enter into the programme, but attention is paid rather to reconnaissance, fortification, surveying, military history, tactics, and strategy, which may be said to form the technical subjects of study.

2713. Are not those technical subjects subjects which would be advantageous to officers for the general service?—An officer before being permitted to compete for the Staff College is required to obtain a certificate from the colonel of his regiment, stating that he is in every respect qualified and fitted as a regimental officer; he is supposed to know his regimental routine and drill thoroughly before he is permitted to compete.

2714. I do not think that answer quite meets my question, which is, whether in your judgment an officer would be rendered more efficient and more competent for general military duty by having studied these technical matters which are taught in the Staff College?—I think he would be rendered more efficient certainly.

2715. Then I would ask you whether in your opinion, you being conversant with the system in the Staff College, you think it would tend to the improvement of the army if the Staff College was on a larger scale, so as to admit of a greater number of young officers to partake of the advantages of it?—I think it would be certainly conducive to the efficiency of the service if it were so, because a number of men returning to their regimental duties after passing through the Staff College would in my opinion tend to raise a feeling of inquiry and study among the other officers of the regiment.

2716. You think it would act as a stimulus to the other officers?—I think it would act as a stimulus certainly.

2717. I infer from what you have told us that the majority, if not the whole of the officers who do study at the Staff College, do so with a view to qualify themselves for staff service?—Certainly.

2718. And not merely to add to their general proficiency as officers?—No, chiefly to qualify themselves for staff service.

2719. Are you conversant with the system of the army college connected with the Prussian army?—Not with the Prussian army; I am with the Austrian army; the Prussian army I am not thoroughly conversant with.

2720. I think I may infer from the answer which you have just given me that you would think it beneficial to the general efficiency of the British army if there were not exactly a staff college, but a military college on a larger scale, and contributing to the professional education of a greater number of officers?—Most decidedly.

2721. Do you think that such a system would be applicable to the army?—I think it most assuredly would be so,

2722. Would you think it desirable to give to officers who have devoted time to such study a professional advantage in the way of earlier promotion?—That is a very grave question, and is, I think, a most difficult point for me to answer off-hand.

2723. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Being interested in it yourself?—Yes, and there are so many points to be considered in it.

2724. (*Lord Hampton.*) Irrespective of any claim to promotion, do you think that an officer who has devoted his time to the general studies at a military college would so far improve himself that he would be more likely than others to be selected either for employment or for promotion?—I think so certainly; my impression is that if such a school could be instituted it would be well that all officers should in turn pass through it before obtaining promotion.

2725. Or at all events all officers should have the option of it?—Yes, they should have the option of it certainly. The course might be a short one, and it might be optional to them to pass the final examination direct, that is to say, without going through the college, or to go through the college before passing. If such a college could be instituted I am perfectly convinced, as far as I can judge myself, that it would be to the interest of the army.

2726. You are not of opinion that the sort of experience which a young officer derives from mere learning of drill and practising with his regiment is all that is desirable for him to obtain with a view to his profession?—Most decidedly not.

2727. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Have you been on the staff

Captain William Cooke.

6th May 1875.

ever since you left the Staff College?—I returned to regimental duty for about eight or nine months.

2728. Is there any understanding that gentlemen who have passed successfully through the college should be employed on the staff within a given time, or have they to take their chance of staff employment?—No officer has any *claim* to employment of any kind on the staff after passing through the Staff College; he takes his chance and is selected according to his qualifications.

2729. How long have you been on the staff?—About four years.

2730. Does the five years' rule apply to your appointment; do you go back to regimental duties?—Yes, I revert to my regimental duties at the end of my five years' service on the staff.

2731. You have not been seconded in your regiment, I suppose?—No.

2732. Some other officer does your duty there?—Yes.

2733. Have you ever considered the question of the expediency of seconding officers who are employed on the staff?—Yes, I have often.

2734. What do you say about it?—I think tha every officer appointed to the staff should be at once seconded.

2735. In fact, his being at the Staff College throws additional work on other officers in the regiment, does it not?—Yes, and not only that, but it has also disadvantages in a social point of view, as it restricts officers from going on leave, and from various employments.

2736. What would you do when you went back to the regiment, when your second would no longer be required, how would you provide for that difficulty?—He would become a supernumerary captain until a step occurred, and then he would be absorbed. I do not know of any other way.

2737. I understood you to say that you had been through Sandhurst. Was that before your entrance to the army?—I was a cadet at Sandhurst before my entrance to the army.

2738. You went through something like a second military education, and what you learnt before was advantageous to you in that examination?—Yes, my cadet training was the same, only on a somewhat lower standard.

2739. Can you speak from your experience of the advantage that that has been to you in your military profession?—Certainly I can.

2740. I understood you to say that you felt that you had an advantage as compared with those who had not had the same opportunities, that in the Staff College studies you started from a higher point than they did?—It undoubtedly gave me very great advantages.

2741. You would like to see that more generally extended to officers of the army?—I should certainly.

2742. What is the process of entry into the Staff College; do they merely send in their names to the commanding officer if they are desirous of competing, or how is it?—There is now a new system, with which I am not thoroughly conversant. A man is attached, I believe, for a month to the staff of a general officer, who reports as to his probable fitness or unfitness for future staff employment, as a sort of trial before he is allowed to go up for examination.

2742*a*. I suppose he has to intimate to his commanding officer that he wishes to go up for examination at the Staff College?—Yes.

2743. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Which carries more weight in deciding a man's position on the list at the Staff College, proficiency in professional technical subjects, or the other subjects, such as high mathematics, physics, geology, &c.?—I do not think any great importance is attached to high mathematics at the present time. I think it rests chiefly between military technical subjects and foreign languages.

2744. You think that military technical subjects, and other professional subjects, have the greatest weight in putting a man in a high position on the list?—Yes, certainly.

2745. Have you had any field service?—No.

2746. Have you taken part in any camps of exercise, or manœuvres on a large scale?—None in this country.

2747. Have you had no opportunity of testing the advantages which you have derived at the Staff College from practical experience?—Not in connection with our own army, but when attending the manœuvres of foreign armies I have found the knowledge and experience gained at the Staff College of very great assistance.

2748. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Could any officer remain in the Staff College unless he studied?—No, without a certain amount of application he could scarcely get beyond the first year.

2749. Is it not the case that many officers sit up very late and get up very early in the morning for purposes of study?—It is.

2750. Have you not known many cases where officers when they went to the college could not ride, but when they left college could ride well?—As a former cavalry officer I had not to go through the equitation school, and had not therefore an opportunity of judging of the officers' riding at the Staff College.

2751. Did you ever go out with drag hounds?—There were no drag hounds at the Staff College when I was there.

2752. Nor with the other hounds?—I was out occasionally with the Queen's, but only very seldom.

2753. Are you aware that at the present time every officer at the Staff College is obliged to have a horse?—I am aware of it from reading the regulations. I have not been at the Staff College since that regulation was introduced, but I believe that it is so.

2754. Are you aware of the fact that a pack of drag hounds are kept there?—Yes, I know it from hearsay.

2755. And that the officers after their hours of study go out with those hounds?—Yes.

2756. (*Chairman.*) Assuming that there are enough men educated at the Staff College now to fill the staff appointments, would you or not consider it an advantage that a larger number should have the opportunity of education there, with a view to the general proficiency of the army?—I consider it would be a decided advantage.

2757. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) If to the degree alluded to by Lord Penzance, a certain pecuniary advantage was added, would you adhere to your former opinion that officers would not compete?—I think that it would depend a great deal upon what the pecuniary value was.

2758. You stated that many of the officers of the Staff College went there to escape foreign or Indian service, or to be settled for two years; would those officers wish to go through the course provided they had no claim for the staff?—I do not think that that would make any difference with that class of men. But I did not say many; I said a small proportion, a minority.

2759. (*Mr. Welby.*) As far as you know, do men going up for the competitive examination to get into the Staff College cram much?—I think they do; they used to certainly. I do not know at the present time whether they do or not.

2760. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) In fact very few men could go up to the Staff College from their regiments without preparatory cramming?—Very few, except for instance those who have been previously educated at the Woolwich Academy or the Cadet College. I passed when I was abroad, so that I had no opportunity for cramming; I relied upon my own knowledge.

2761. (*Chairman.*) You had no need to cram?—No, I did not feel it necessary, but that I attribute chiefly to my previous education at the Cadet College.

2762. (*Mr. Welby.*) As the number of competitors

increase cramming will increase?—Cramming will certainly increase in proportion.

2763. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) I presume that you were recommended to employment in the Topographical Department owing to your knowledge of foreign languages?—At the time I passed out of the Staff College the sole qualification for the Topographical Department was proficiency in high mathematics. I did not take up high mathematics as a subject of study at the Staff College, but I happened to be acquainted with several foreign languages, and General Napier when a vacancy occurred recommended me, I believe, on that account; but I was not directly recommended from the Staff College for employment in the Topographical Department.

Captain William Cooke.
6th May 1875.

The witness withdrew.

Captain F. C. H. Clarke, R.A., examined.

Captain F. C. H. Clarke, R.A.

2764. (*Chairman.*) Your rank, I believe, is captain in the army?—It is.

2765. In what regiment are you?—In the artillery.

2766. Have you passed through the Staff College?—Yes.

2767. How many years' service have you now?—15½ years.

2768. And how long is it since you left the Staff College?—In December 1868.

2769. You were there two years I suppose?—Yes.

2770. Were there many candidates for admission to the Staff College at the time when you succeeded in passing the examination for it?—As well as I remember there were from 28 to 30 candidates for 15 vacancies.

2771. During the time you were there I suppose you had an opportunity of ascertaining pretty well the feelings and motives of those who had entered the Staff College; would you say that the majority of those who went into the Staff College went there for the purpose of gaining staff appointments and improving themselves by a superior military education?—I think, with very few exceptions, most of the officers went there with a view to their personal advancement in the service.

2772. In the sense of obtaining subsequent staff appointments?—Yes.

2773. But were there some who went for collateral motives and reasons, such as escaping regimental duty and being in a fixed position, instead of moving about?—Yes, I think that there are generally one or two in each batch who go there to avoid foreign service and other duties for which they have a distaste.

2774. There are periodical examinations at the Staff College every quarter, are there not?—Chiefly every half year.

2775. And they have a final examination?—Yes, a final examination is held at the end of the two years' course.

2776. Is a certificate given at the end of the course which has reference to the sort of examination that is passed?—I am not aware that any certificate is given to the officers.

2777. There is of course a graduated list of those who passed according to their merit?—Yes.

2778. Do the places on that list depend entirely upon proficiency in the examination, or is it coupled with general conduct while at the college?—Entirely upon proficiency in the examination.

2779. The subjects of examination are chiefly military, are they not?—There are one or two non-military subjects, such as experimental sciences and geology, but they are mostly taught with reference to their bearing on military questions.

2780. And the other subjects are purely military?—Yes.

2781. Of course there are some who work harder than others in the Staff College, as in all other educational institutions; but would it be possible for a man to avoid much labour if he liked in passing the college?—There is a certain number of attendances at the lectures on the obligatory subjects which each man is bound to keep (at least it was the case in my time), and consequently his presence is compulsory at study during those hours. In other subjects his attendance is more or less voluntary.

2782. Were there any other means taken to enforce his benefiting by those lectures?—None. The result of the examination at the end of the year would alone show whether he had done so.

2783. Supposing he had not, what would happen then; he would not pass, I presume?—There have been cases of men not passing.

2784. But the large majority do pass, do they not?—Yes, the large majority pass.

2785. Are there any means taken whereby a man who does not study as he ought to study, or make use of the lectures for his own benefit as he should do, can be withdrawn from the college?—I believe it is the duty of the commandant of the Staff College to report to the Commander-in-Chief the cases of those officers who have not passed satisfactory examinations.

2786. Did you know of such a case during your time?—No instance of an officer's removal on those grounds occurred while I was at the college.

2787. Practically those who go there remain two years, and the worst that happens to them is that they do not pass?—Yes.

2788. With reference to the sort of studies pursued there, is it your opinion that for the general purposes of after employment on the staff, the standard which is required at the college is too high or not?—I do not consider it too high.

2789. You would not lower it?—No.

2790. Had you been a cadet at Sandhurst?—I was an Addiscombe cadet.

2791. Therefore you enjoyed a certain advantage over many others?—Yes.

2792. You found, did you not, your previous studies of considerable service to you?—Yes.

2793. If the Staff College were thrown open to a larger number of officers, and if a little less high standard of proficiency were required, would that in your opinion be a good thing for the proficiency of those officers in their after life in the army?—I do not think it would be at all advisable to lower the standard at the Staff College.

2794. About how many go up at a time for the final examination?—In my time there were 13.

2795. How many out of those failed to pass?—None failed to pass.

2796. It is a very rare thing, is it not, for an officer to fail to pass at the end of the course?—A very rare thing.

2797. The subjects of the studies as you have told us being foreign languages and military subjects, do mathematics hold a high place amongst the studies there?—The "lower course" of mathematics had no advantage in point of marks over other voluntary subjects, but there was a slight advantage in the case of the "higher course."

2798. What was that advantage?—I think that the marks were in the proportion of five to four as regards other subjects in favour of the higher mathematics.

2799. What do you understand by the higher mathematics?—It was a course of mathematics including the higher branches of the calculus, astronomy, and geodesy, which was compulsory in my time for those officers wishing to qualify for the Topographical Department of the War Office and the Ordnance Survey. By passing a satisfactory examination in those subjects they were recommended to His Royal Highness for employment in those branches.

Captain F. C. H. Clarke, R.A.

6th May 1875.

2800. And not only so, but did I understand you that to that particular subject was accorded a larger number of marks, so that it told well in the examination ?—Yes; but only a few men felt inclined to go in for that subject, and the standard of examination being rather high, it practically gave them no great advantage.

2801. You mean that there were few who availed themselves of that advantage ?—There were few who cared to run the risk of failure in getting the qualifying minimum; the examination papers were comparatively so difficult that the actual marks gained by average men was not greater than if they had employed themselves on other voluntary subjects of less difficulty, such as geology.

2802. The numbers who attacked the subject were not very great, and those who did, did not always attain sufficient proficiency to make it worth their while ?—Just so.

2803. Then perhaps it would be your opinion that in that respect the studies of the Staff College might be somewhat modified ?—Yes; there is no object now in teaching the "higher course" of mathematics for the general staff of the army.

2804. Do you think that the Staff College might be used like a university, namely, as a body giving education and granting a degree which might be looked upon and taken as a stamp in after life of a man's general capacity, but which should lead to no special rights or claims to staff appointment. Of course it would lead to their advancement as giving the Commander-in-Chief a higher opinion of their capacities, but it would give no special claim ?—I do not think that the inducement would be sufficient. I do not believe that men would go in under such a system.

2805. Then, on the other hand, if the demands made upon them were less, and they were submitted to a less stringent examination, might it induce them to undergo that amount of labour for the purpose of improving themselves, and for the purpose of getting that sort of stamp affixed to them which would be accorded by a degree ?—Your lordship's question assumes that the examination is too difficult.

2806. Not that it is too difficult under existing circumstances, but I am suggesting to your mind a different mode of dealing with it, and that is, lowering the standard of the examination, and increasing the number to whom the Staff College is open, merely giving a degree to those who had passed, without giving them any special claim to staff employment, or any other employment, by which means the general knowledge of the officers of the army who went through the college would of course be improved. Under those circumstances would more men attend, do you think ?—I do not think they would.

2807. (*Lord Hampton.*) Have you ever considered whether it might be advantageous to the army generally, and tend to increase its efficiency, if young officers had the benefit of more professional instruction than they get ?—I think that the officers get sufficient instruction at present for the general purposes of the service.

2808. Where do they get it ?—The guards, line, and cavalry get it at Sandhurst, for it is compulsory for all sub-lieutenants to go there; at Woolwich in the case of the artillery, and at Chatham in the case of the engineers. Moreover, all officers may receive instruction, if they wish it, from the garrison instructor at any period of their subsequent service.

2809. Under the new regulations is Sandhurst able to receive all the young officers who enter the army ?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the capabilities of Sandhurst to be able to answer the question.

2810. If it is, do you think that the education that they get at Sandhurst would meet all the requirements of the army ?—Yes.

2811. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is the examination required when a cadet is appointed to the royal artillery or the royal engineers a higher or a lower test than the examination to pass the Staff College ?—Although the subjects of examination are in the main the same, the degree of knowledge required varies at the two establishments, being in some cases higher, in others lower, so that it is difficult to say which is the higher test on the whole.

2812. As to mathematics, is the test higher in mathematics at the Staff College or at the Cadet College ?—At the Cadet Academy.

2813. In military surveying which is it ?—About the same at both.

2814. In reconnaissance ?—At the Staff College.

2815. In languages ?—At the Staff College.

2816. In military history ?—At the Staff College.

2817. Geology they all learn in both, I believe ?—Yes.

2818. Which is the highest ?—They are about the same in geology.

2819. Then military history, reconnaissance, and languages are the only points in which the examination is higher in the Staff College than in the Royal Cadet Academy ?—Yes.

2820. Does an officer of the royal artillery require two years to learn those subjects ?—No; because there are instances where officers of that arm have passed the final examination without going through the college.

2821. You were there two years, were you not ?—Yes, I was there two years.

2822. Could you not have passed in a shorter time than that ?—Yes.

2823. As you were able to pass in a shorter time, why did you not go up for one year, which was allowed at that period, instead of leaving your regiment and going to college for two years, while other officers were doing your duty ?—I am strongly of opinion that it is for the benefit of the public service, as regards uniformity of system and harmonious working of the staff, that staff officers should be trained in the same school and in the same line of thought; in other words, that they should have a sound basis of general principles and of staff duties acquired under the guidance of the competent professors at the college. To which end a training and residence together of at least two years are necessary. In my particular case I was anxious to avail myself of the course of strategy, tactics, organization and supply of armies, subjects of which the knowledge was not nearly so widely spread in the army in 1866-7 as at present. Partly I might have been guided by precedent, as in the history of the college no officer had taken advantage of the permission in question. Moreover, I wished to qualify in the "higher course" of mathematics, and as I had not touched that subject for eight years I could not, with the pressure of other subjects, have passed in it in one year.

2824. I thought you told us that the higher test of mathematics was at the Royal Cadet Academy ?—I did not include in my answer the "higher course." I referred to the course ordinarily taken up. The former goes more deeply into the subject than the course at the academy.

2825. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) There are 40 officers in the Staff College at the present time, are there not ?—Yes; I believe the number is 40.

2826. If it was thrown open to 100 officers, do you think that 100 officers would compete to go in for admission to the Staff College ?—Yes, I think so, in the year.

2827. I presume you think that it would be an advantage to the service if 100 officers received the professional knowledge that only 40 receive at the present moment ?—Certainly.

The witness withdrew.

Major Redvers Buller examined.

Major R. Buller.

6th May 1875.

2828. (*Chairman.*) Are you a major in the army?—Yes.

2829. In what regiment are you?—In the 60th?

2830. How many years' service have you?—Seventeen, very nearly 18.

2831. How long is it since you passed through the Staff College?—I never passed through. I should have passed out in 1873, but I left it to go out to the Gold Coast, and when I came home his Royal Highness said that I should not be required to finish my course there. I only had the examination to go through when I went out. I was told that I should not be required to go through the final examination. I had been there nearly two years.

2832. Had you passed through the various examinations which had taken place during that time?—Yes; I had passed everything but the final examination.

2833. Were there many competitors when you offered yourself for the college?—Yes, I think more than there had ever been; there were nearly 50.

2834. For how many vacancies?—For 20 vacancies.

2835. We are told that sometimes men desire to go to the Staff College because they wish to avoid foreign service, and other reasons, besides the desire to improve themselves and get staff appointment; was that your experience?—Yes, I am afraid so. I think that generally is the rule.

2836. Do many go with those collateral motives?—I should think that of 20 who get in, nearly one half of them would be men who go for some other reason than because they want to get staff appointments.

2837. They must work when they get there, must they not, or can they manage to shirk all the very hard labour?—It is a very pleasant place when you are there, I think, but the hard labour is the getting in.

2838. For that, I suppose, there is a good deal of cramming, is there not?—Yes. It cost me 40*l.* in cramming to get in. There is a regular man who does it, and I went through that man's cramming.

2839. Is there one special man who has a great reputation?—Yes.

2840. But there are others, I suppose, who do the same office, or is there only one who does it?—There is one man who practically crams almost everybody, and who makes it a business, Captain Lendy, a very well-known man.

2841. And he charged you 40*l.* for the month?—Including everything it cost me 40*l.*

2842. When you get into the college are we to understand that the hard work ceases?—Yes. You have to do, of course, a certain amount; but anybody who can get in can go through the Staff College without hard work. It is pleasant work.

2843. We are told that they have to attend a certain number of lectures, and so forth?—Yes, that is so.

2844. Supposing that a man attends the lectures, but does not trouble himself much about them, does he remain in the college?—At the end of the first year there is a probationary examination.

2845. Is that a very hard one, or one that a man can pass through with anything like attention?—With even moderate attention he will pass it. There are cases in which men do not pass.

2846. During your time was anybody sent out of the college?—One was sent out in my time, three the time but one before, and three the time after me, in each case out of the 20.

2847. Would you say that that was really for not working?—I think it is hardly fair to say that. Certainly in two cases they were afraid of particular subjects, and they overworked in those, and got confused generally. In one case it was a certainly able man in some things who missed in that examination; because he thought he did not know mathematics he worked himself foolish.

2848. We are told that there is a very stiff examination in what may be called the higher mathematics; is that so?—No, not at the college.

2849. Is there not a branch of higher mathematics which is made a subject of examination?—You are taught a certain amount of mathematics there, but really it is very elementary.

2850. How high does it go in mathematics?—It goes to trigonometry, and sufficient spherical trigonometry to enable you to take observations at sea.

2851. Not the differential calculus?—No. In the old Staff College course to be successful you required to have a considerable knowledge of mathematics, but that has been altered.

2852. The standard has been considerably reduced?—Yes.

2853. Do you think that it might be further reduced with benefit?—Hardly, I think.

2854. The system when you were there was that upon passing the Staff College you had a certain claim to staff appointment. Do you think that that is a desirable system, or would you treat it as a degree giving a man a certain stamp which might induce the authorities afterwards to employ him or not?—I think it ought to be thoroughly understood that a man goes there and has no claim whatever.

2855. What leads you to that opinion?—I think that it would keep out of the college a great many men whom it is not desirable for the army to go there. There are a large number of men, no doubt, who go there only to get staff appointments. It will give them either a pleasant berth or a little more money, or they get out of going to India, not for professional reasons.

2856. You think it acts badly then in that way, in inducing men to go for some definite object, or personal convenience or profit?—Yes, I think so, and I think it is very hard in the army to know whether a man is a good man or not until he is tried. A man may be very good in some things, he may be socially a very pleasant man in his regiment, and so much liked that they do not like not to recommend him to go there; he goes there, and some reason appears why he should never be a staff officer.

2857. Therefore you would not make the passing of the college a claim for employment?—No, I certainly think it ought not to be.

2858. But simply a step?—I think that in course of time a man should not, except he had distinguished himself in the field, have a staff appointment unless he had been there. The education is valuable, as of course it would be to all, but I consider that no man by going there should have a claim to a staff appointment.

2859. You said except he had distinguished himself in the field; if he did that you would not then debar him from staff appointments?—No, of course not; if a man distinguished himself in the field, or in the command of a regiment.

2860. You would not exclude him because he had not gone through the college?—Certainly not.

2861. But on the other hand, as a rule you would like the Staff College examination as a test of merit?—Yes, as a test of a sufficient amount of application, and a sufficient desire to get on in the service, as shown by the man having taken the trouble to go there.

2862. Would you alter the studies or the range of examination at all at the Staff College as you found it, or were you satisfied with it as it was?—I think it could be altered considerably with great advantage now.

2863. In what direction?—Practically I would alter the whole of the first year's course in the Staff College. A man has to do things then which I consider he ought to know before he goes there. When the Staff College was first started there were no garrison instructors, there was no garrison course. I was 12 years in the army, and I never had a chance of learning anything about my profession; there were no places that you could go to to learn it. Now in every large garrison every officer has to go through a course of garrison instruction, and I think that no officer should be allowed to go into the Staff College unless he has passed a

Major R. Buller.

6th May 1875.

high qualification in the garrison course, and then the whole of the first year's educational course as it is at present at the Staff College could be left out; a man would have done it before he went there.

2864. Would that result in their being able to keep men a less length of time there, say one year instead of two?—I think it should result in the present second year's course being the first year's course. Now, after leaving the Staff College, an officer is attached to the other two arms of the service for two or three months in each case. That might come in the second year, and the rest I think should be taken up with practical instruction. There should be a much more extended course of outdoor instruction than is given now.

2865. You would suppress the first year's instruction, in the sense that the candidates should be required to have attained proficiency in it before they go; then as regards the further instruction you would modify that by teaching a man his duties in the other branches of the service, and what they call outdoor instruction?—Yes; I say the first year, using that as a general term; there are certain things which are taught in the first year that would come probably in the second.

2866. What would be the mode of entry to the college as you would wish to see it; should it be by competitive examination and the cramming system?—I suppose it would always have to be competition. One would like it not to be, but I should like more care taken in the selection of officers who are allowed to compete.

2867. Through the commanding officer of a regiment directly, do you mean?—Through the different commanding officers.

2868. That the commanding officer should be called upon to report as to the likelihood of an individual becoming a useful staff officer before he went there?—They have to do that at present; but the present system is that there are a certain number of confidential questions, and there is a board of three officers who answer them confidentially together. I think that the general officer should be obliged to ask those three officers their individual opinions. You very often see doubtful answers to those confidential questions; for instance to "Is he of active and energetic habits?" a board may answer "Sufficiently so," or "We think so." I think that if individual officers were cross-questioned rather on their opinion, you might find out that a man who probably was in some respects a good officer was never likely to make a good staff officer.

2869. Therefore you would rather more rigidly inquire before entering the Staff College whether they were likely to make good staff officers?—Yes.

2870. And you would do that through the instrumentality of the inspecting general?—Yes. At present when two officers of a regiment compete in the same year the one who gets most marks gets in. I think that the best of the two professionally should be the only one allowed to go up.

2871. Would not it be a benefit to the army generally, quite irrespective of staff appointments, if the number now received at the Staff College were increased?—I think so certainly.

2872. So that this sort of education might be open to a larger number?—I am sure of it.

2873. Would there be a larger number ready to go?—Yes.

2874. Even without a claim for staff appointment?—Yes, I think so.

2875. (*Lord Hampton.*) In describing the course which you should desire to see at the Staff College, you alluded to practical instruction. What was in your mind when you spoke of practical instruction?—I think that it might be very easily managed that students at the Staff College should be sent out to do extended reconnaissances with the view of reporting on ground for occupation by troops; for instance, he might be given two or three or four counties in England in which to select a good place to fight a battle on, and to put down upon paper all the arrangements to be made. With a competent professor to correct that sort of instruction afterwards it would no doubt be of great value to officers.

2876. So as to increase their tactical knowledge?—Yes, in that respect to increase their tactical knowledge; and, again, I think that students might be ordered to move a paper army corps through a certain number of counties in England, writing out the requisite orders for each day, one commanding a corps, one each division, one each brigade, so as to learn the proper duties of a staff officer. At present in the army these duties are only picked up.

2877. (*Chairman.*) The practical duties are now learnt in practice?—Yes, or by experiment rather.

2878. (*Lord Hampton.*) You mean that you would not devote the two years of the Staff College entirely to book instruction?—Quite so.

2879. I presume that would be your meaning, that when they join the second year's course of instruction you would have young officers sent out in the way you have described, to practise what they had learnt; how would you have that followed up; would it be by each officer being obliged to report to the college on what he had done?—He would be set a scheme to do by his professor. There is at present much more practical work at the Staff College than there used to be, but the outdoor work is limited merely to six weeks. I think it ought to be extended at least over three months, and I would have a larger scope given to it.

2880. Do I rightly understand you to wish that officers should enter the Staff College, having obtained that acquirement which they now gain by the end of the first year?—Yes, with the exception of mathematics.

2881. How should you propose that they should qualify themselves to that extent?—By courses of garrison instruction.

2882. Where should they have them?—They are now established in all districts in England; there is a properly appointed garrison instructor and there is a regular course, and at present all subalterns have to pass an examination in garrison instruction.

2883. How long has that been the case?—Since about 1871.

2884. Is not that a great advance upon any pre-existing system?—Yes; a great advance.

2885. I think you would approve of the proposal to extend the Staff College, so as to receive a larger number of officers?—Yes.

2886. Would you approve of extending it so far as to enable it to accommodate a very large number of officers, or how many would you suggest?—That is a question I could hardly answer; it would require a good deal of consideration to fix the number of officers. I do not know how many there are in the army.

2887. You do not intend by the answers which you have given to express an opinion that the Staff College should be so far altered in character as to become rather a military college, where a large number of officers might acquire professional as well as technical knowledge?—No, not at all. I think it should be reserved as far as possible for officers who are training for the staff.

2888. And then you would trust partly to Sandhurst and partly to garrison instruction to qualify young officers to enter the Staff College?—Yes, and their own work afterwards. The only men who should be able to get into the Staff College should be men who have done well at Sandhurst and in garrison instruction.

2889. As to the present system, are all young officers who enter the army obliged to pass through Sandhurst?—I think not all at present; all except those who go to the Indian regiments, if I understand the last order, and a certain per-centage of the foreign service regiments, but it has been so much altered of late that I cannot speak with certainty.

2890. You have spoken of the garrison instructors.

Am I right in the opinion that those garrison instructors have been established in some measure to compensate for the insufficiency of Sandhurst?—I do not think so. I understood that the garrison instructors were established to supply what was really a crying want. Up to the time of their being established an officer joining the army had no means whatever by which he could, except by purely private study, be able to learn anything about what I may call the details of his profession.

2891. Which was felt to be a great deficiency?—Yes; I imagine that was why they were appointed.

2892. Which would be the best mode of compensating for that deficiency; by establishing garrison instructors in every garrison, or by having an extended college where all the young officers might study?—I should prefer myself the garrison instructor, and let the best of his pupils go into the upper college.

2893. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) As to the expense of the Staff College, was any part of your maintenance when there borne by the public, or did you mess together as you would do in the regiment?—The public allows something towards the officers' mess fund.

2894. By going there do the officers incur pecuniary sacrifice?—Yes.

2895. I suppose it is not a thing which is very much sought after, although there may be a certain number who compete for it; it does not seem to be a very keen competition?—Some years ago it had a bad name. It was asserted by its detractors that it was composed of shirks and duffers, and consequently a great many good men would not go there; but I think now it is far more popular.

2896. You think it really is attractive to the service?—I think so.

2897. There is no absolute engagement, is there, with the gentlemen who have been through it, that they shall be employed on the staff, it is merely a possibility that they will get staff employment?—They think that there is an engagement, at least they choose to say so.

2898. But a great many of them do get employment on the staff as a matter of fact?—Yes; nearly all of them I think.

2899. Do you think it could be worked by making it more a matter of prize amongst regimental officers, if it is a desirable thing to get, that the men who are most prominent amongst young officers should either compete, or be selected by the commanding officer as most likely subjects for the Staff College education?—I should like to see it done in that way, but I do not think you will ever do it, unless some promotion is given to men who go through it. They must get something out of it.

2900. It must be made more attractive?—Yes, I think it ought to be.

2901. I suppose that employment on the staff itself is attractive to officers, is it not, generally?—It is attractive while it lasts; but then if they go back to their regiments they get discontented, I think.

2902. You would not advocate the five years' rule, or something equivalent to it; you do not wish to see the staff corps a separate establishment altogether from the rest of the army?—No, not at all.

2903. Then some time or other the officer must expect to go back to his regiment?—Yes, if he has done a certain amount of regimental duty as captain, and done the duties of the staff appointment well, he should go back to his regiment in a higher position.

2904. You would make it a claim to promotion?—Yes.

2905. Promotion by selection in fact?—Yes, it would be selection after trial.

2906. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you think that the fact of a man passing the Staff College should be sufficient to establish his fitness for the staff?—No, I think not.

2907. Have you known men at the college whom you under no circumstances would have appointed to the staff?—Yes, I am sorry to say that I have.

2908. Is not the practical work held rather subordinate to the more intellectual studies?—As I said just now, the practical work is becoming more important every year, I believe.

2909. Is the evil rectifying itself?—It is.

2910. You served in the field as a staff officer in Ashantee, did you not?—Yes, I did for a short time.

2911. Did you find in your own case that your studies at the Staff College practically benefited you as a staff officer?—Yes, I did certainly; but I do not think I did very much.

2912. In what respect did you find that your education at the Staff College was inadequate to your position as a staff officer?—The details of a staff officer's duties I had learnt nothing of. I went into the Staff College before an officer was obliged to be attached to a general officer's staff prior to his being allowed to compete. Now an officer is obliged to be attached for a month before he is allowed to go in, so that he probably would have a certain amount of the experience which I wanted.

2913. Although it is a short period for the study of reconnaissance and surveying, it is very complete as far as it goes, is it not, at the Staff College?—I think there is too much surveying and too little reconnaissance

2914. They are rather mixed up together, that is to say, the one is carried on much about the same time as the other, is it not, at the Staff College?—Not quite. That was rather my point in proposing to change the system in the first year. An officer, I think, ought to be forced to know enough surveying and drawing before he goes in. Now that is not the case, he is allowed to go into the Staff College knowing absolutely none.

2915. He learns it altogether at the Staff College?—Yes, I am myself an example. When I went into the Staff College I knew nothing of military drawing.

2916. He learns the rudiments of it at the Staff College?—Yes, which I think he should know before he goes there.

2917. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) You appear to think that it is not necessary for officers to study; can an officer possibly remain at college unless he studies tolerably hard?—I think so. Of course it depends upon what one considers to be tolerably hard study; two hours a day besides his lectures would enable a man to pass well enough.

2918. How long do his lectures last?—They vary. There are never more than two that he need attend in any day of about an hour each. I wish to draw a difference between studying and obligatory work. There is a certain amount of that which comes to be considered a duty that has to be done at the Staff College. For instance, for some months while I was there I spent the greater part of two days every week drawing a picture of a fort in Flanders, which with deference to my professors I think was a waste of time. It had to be got through. I had to do it, but it was not in the least a study, it was a certain amount of exercise in drawing, and that was all.

2919. You could not have been studying at the time you were drawing that plan, although you were occupied in doing it?—Yes, I was occupied, but it is not a work of mind at all; there is a great deal of mechanical work in it. And in fact it was mechanical instruction in drawing, which I think should have been done before I went there.

2920. Is it not the case that officers sit up late and get up early in order to get through the work that they have to do?—Some do and some do not, most distinctly. It is of course necessary in some cases that they should do so in order to pass, but those men, I think, are men who should not go in.

2921. Because they have not sufficient capacity?—I have seen cases of men there who have worked nearly the whole day for weeks and weeks together, but they are not men who I should think would ever make good staff officers.

2922. Have you not known many cases where officers went to the college when they could not ride, and yet when they left the college could ride well both

Major R. Buller.

6th May 1875.

in the *manège* and in the field ?—Yes, I have known two certainly in my own experience.

2923. And that was learnt at the college ?—Yes, that was learnt at the college.

2924. Will you read over those questions which have to be answered by the commanding officer and major of a regiment previous to an officer being allowed to compete for the Staff College, and state whether if those questions be accurately replied to, it is possible or likely that an officer not qualified to make a good staff officer can be allowed to compete ?—These questions are replied to by a board, and that was the very point which I mentioned just now, that I thought being replied to collectively they did not always give the individual opinion of each of these officers.

2925. (*Chairman.*) Therefore your answer would be that the questions are not accurately answered ?—I think that in some cases, perhaps, they are not accurately answered. Everyone knows how difficult it is to get a true report about anybody. A man who is very popular in the regiment socially would get perhaps a more favourable report than in other respects he deserved.

2926. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Why did you go to the Staff College ?—Because I wanted to get transferred to my own battalion on promotion. I was promoted out of the battalion that I had been in for many years. I could not arrange an exchange, and I went to the Staff College in order to be in England, and to try to get a transfer. That was the real reason, and I succeeded in it.

2927. At the time you went to the Staff College was not it the rule that no officer who had not passed through the Staff College should be appointed to the lower staff appointments, and that after the Staff College had been gone on for a certain number of years no officer should be appointed to the staff who had not passed the examination under the Queen's regulations of 1867 ?—I have seen it so stated, but I do not know.

2928. Have you known men on the staff who had not passed through the Staff College, and who were quite unfit for their duties ?—I have not had a very large experience of staff officers.

2929. Would not officers, if they went through the Staff College young, have an opportunity of learning the practical part of their duties by experience after they had gone through the college ?—I think not ; and I think that they are now allowed to go too young into the Staff College. It is one of my strongest feelings about the Staff College, that no subaltern should be allowed to go in unless he is also going to be promoted.

2930. You are on the staff at the present moment. Could the details of your office be learnt by any Staff College education ?—No.

2931. Would it be practicable to teach them at college ?—No, not the details of my individual office. But I think that a great deal of the details of a staff officer's life must be learnt by practical instruction.

2932. Have you ever been employed on any other staff office except your present appointment ?—I have done duty for a good many officers at different places and different times.

2933. (*Lord Hampton*) Is your rank of major a brevet rank for your services in the Ashantee war ?—Yes.

2934. (*Chairman.*) Are you still captain in your regiment ?—Yes, I shall be captain for the next 10 years.

2935. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) It has been suggested that in substitution for brevet rank as a reward it might be advisable to give a good service pension. What do you think of that suggestion. How would it be accepted in the army ?—I should be very sorry to see it come in.

2936. In your own case what would you have thought if the option had been given you ?—In my own case, I am not a poor man ; but my idea would be that it would destroy wholly the gentlemanlike feeling in the army if it came to be considered that an officer's legitimate ambition was the hope of obtaining a certain number of pounds. Now he hopes for promotion because he is fond of the service and wants to get on.

2937. Supposing you put yourself in the position of a poor man ?—I do not think any poor man that I know or is a friend of mine but would rather have promotion, at least I should hope he would at any rate.

2938. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) But brevet promotion is accompanied, is it not, by a pecuniary reward ?—2*s.* a day, but I understood the suggestion to be a very considerable increase of pay without promotion.

2939. (*Chairman.*) But the brevet does not carry with it any money payment, except in the case of brevet majors, does it ?—No.

2940. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) It has been suggested before the Commission that brevet promotion has been given too numerously, and that for the future the number of brevet promotions should be reduced, and therefore if that was carried out there would be considerable loss to the officers of the army ; and then the idea has suggested itself to some minds whether that loss might not be made up by giving a military medal accompanied with a good service pension of equal value to the brevet majority, because it has been stated that owing to the vast number of brevet promotions given in the Crimea, the upper ranks of the army are clogged, and the promotion to the rank of general officer is only obtained at a very late age, and therefore it is detrimental to the service that such a large amount of brevet promotion should be conferred ?—If you had a small army and rapid promotion, whether by brevet or in any other way, would it not be the same case. Supposing we had another war like the Crimean war, and the Indian mutiny following immediately afterwards, and a large number of promotions taking place you would have what happened in that case, namely, the officers of the army of the same age. It seems to me that that must happen. Unluckily men like myself who join after the run of promotion naturally do not get on quite so fast as those who are only a very little older. I think any war almost would do that.

2941. (*Lord Hampton.*) There are good service pensions in the army now, are there not ?—Yes.

2942. And there are good service pensions to a considerable extent in the navy also. Have you ever heard that it is considered in the least inconsistent with the high gentlemanly feeling of the officers to accept those pensions ?—No ; I am speaking of a man who is offered the option between promotion in the army and a pension.

2943. You are being asked questions now on a very important matter. It has been alleged over and over again before this Commission that that system of advantage to officers which you yourself to your honor have received, namely, brevet promotion for service, has been carried much further than it ought to be, and it has been further suggested whether it might not be advisable to reduce the number of brevet promotions for service, and to substitute for that brevet promotion a system of good service pensions. Is it your opinion, as an officer, that there would be anything in such a system as that in the least degree inconsistent with the highest feelings of an honourable officer ?—This is the first I have heard of it, and my feeling is that if, as I understand, there are to be a certain number of brevets and a certain number of pensions, it will come that there will have to be a selection or choice, and that it is most unfair to ask any officer to select between promotion and money down.

2944. It might turn probably, might it not, not so much upon selecting, upon giving A a pension, and B brevet, but upon the nature of the service performed ; but supposing it to be a system adopted in the army that good service under certain circumstances should be rewarded by a certain increase of pay, surely there is nothing at all inconsistent with the feeling of an honourable man in accepting that reward ?—I did not before understand the proposition to be the establish-

ment of a good service pension as a definite reward for particular services, but rather its establishment as alternative with a brevet. As you now put it, the case is altered.

2945. (*Chairman.*) You do not see anything derogatory to a man, if this system was established, in accepting it?—No, not at all, if it was a definite duty, rewarded in a definite way.

2946. (*Lord Hampton.*) Then we have had a third suggestion, that instead of either brevet or pension, service in the field might be rewarded by some personal decoration, by way of an order of merit, or something of that kind; do you think that that would be highly esteemed by officers, and should you approve of it?—It is not a subject which I have thought of.

Major R. Buller.

6th May 1875.

2947. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Are you aware that you received an increase of emolument of about 70*l.* a year when you got your brevet majority?—I got 2*s.* a day.

2948. And a horse, 2*s.* a day more, and a servant?—I have to buy and keep the horse and pay the servant.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Tuesday, 11th May 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. J. MACLEAN examined.

Lieut.-Col. Maclean.

11May 1875.

2949. (*Chairman.*) How long have you been in command of the Rifle brigade?—Not quite two months, in command of one of its battalions.

2950. How many years' service have you?—Within a few days of 30 years.

2951. What is your age?—47.

2952. When did you attain your majority?—In 1868.

2953. I will ask you first what your opinion is about the rule which now obtains as to your holding your present command for not more than five years. Do you think that that rule is an advantageous one for the service if rigidly acted upon?—Undoubtedly. It is hard perhaps in individual cases, but for the benefit of the service and for the interests of regiments generally, I think it a good rule.

2954. In what respect do you regard it as being advantageous; do you regard it as being advantageous for the purpose of creating promotion?—As advantageous to the service in the matter of promotion, and to the regiment also, because I consider that five years is ample time for a man to be in command. I think the continuous infusion of fresh blood in command decidedly advantageous.

2955. Within five years a man can probably acquire all that has to be acquired in the way of professional knowledge as the commanding officer of a regiment?—Yes, if he does not do that in five years, he probably never will.

2956. Assuming that to be so at present as matters stand, at the end of five years you will have to go on half pay?—Yes, that of course is an individual hardship.

2957. And you might have to remain on half pay before you became major-general for perhaps seven or eight years?—Longer, I am afraid.

2958. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Nearer 20 years would it not be?—That is more likely, but one might say perhaps 12 years on an average.

2959. (*Chairman.*) It is suggested that you might have to wait after your five years have expired for eight years, and you say that it would be much longer?—It is much longer; it used to be about 12 years, now it is anticipated that it will be very much longer.

2960. You think that it would be 12 years and upwards?—Yes.

2961. If we add 12 to the five years, that would make you 64 by the time you became major-general?—Quite so.

2962. Is that in your opinion early enough in life to become a major-general?—No, it is too old for the work.

2963. What would be your opinion of any system under which an officer in the position that you describe yourself, that is, retiring from the command at the age of 52, were offered a retiring pension of a reasonable amount with an honorary step in rank, would that be accepted, do you think, to any extent amongst the officers at present in the army?—Undoubtedly, if the retiring pension was at all commensurate with the income previously enjoyed.

2964. Whatever age an officer might be when his five years expired, supposing a retiring pension of an adequate amount were offered to him with a step of honorary rank, you think that it might be accepted?—Quite so.

2965. What is the sort of amount which is in your mind?—I name no definite amount, but he should not be placed in a worse pecuniary position because he is retiring than he would be in if he were allowed to hold on.

2966. If he held on, you see, he would be on half pay, which would not be a very good pecuniary position?—I mean if he were allowed to hold on in command.

2967. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) In that case he would have his full pay and allowances?—As it will come to myself at the specified time, I simply say that he should not be placed in a worse position pecuniarily because he is forced to retire, than he would be in if he was allowed to hold on; practically it comes to very nearly the same thing.

2968. (*Chairman.*) But terms of that sort you think would probably be accepted by a considerable number?—Yes, certainly, by those who did not spend money in purchasing their commission, as in the case of those who are now entering the service, and who have not been called upon to spend money to obtain their position, if they were retired with the income that they had previously reached, I consider that they could have no possible fault to find.

2969. I do not mean whether they would think themselves ill-treated if they were compulsorily retired, but supposing the condition were placed before them of remaining on half pay with the prospect of 10 or 12 or perhaps more years to wait before they reached the fixed establishment of generals, would they be likely to accept such a pension as we have alluded to, in lieu

Lieut.-Col. Maclean.

11 May 1875.

of that chance ?—I think, certainly, a great many men would after a certain time of life.

2970. A certain number would remain in order to get on to the generals' fixed establishment ?—Yes, those who have been tolerably fortunate in rapidity of promotion would remain, and those who like myself, had not been fortunate, would accept the retirement.

2971. Following out this question of retirement and pensions, it is the fact, is it not, that owing to there being but two majors in a regiment, and a large number of captains and subaltern officers, many of the captains attain a considerable age and a considerable number of years' service before they have a chance of getting any promotion, there is a sort of block as it were at the head of the captains' list ?—Yes.

2972. Do you think it would be a good plan that after a certain number of years' service if a captain had not been fortunate enough to get promotion he should be compulsorily retired on full pay ?—Yes, with a view to promotion, and in that respect as regards the interests of the service unquestionably it would be an advantage.

2973. Is it a measure which you think would greatly benefit the army and one which would be favourably received ?—I am not quite so sure about that, it is an innovation in the army, and all innovations are hardly scanned.

2974. I am not speaking of course of officers who had entered the army before the abolition of purchase, but of the army of the future, if we may so call it, if a man knew on entering the service that after a certain number of years he did not get promotion to a majority he would have to be retired compulsorily at the former pay for captain on an adequate pension, you do not think that that would be a hardship ?—I do not think it would be a hardship if he entered the service with a knowledge of that fact staring him in the face.

2975. What is your opinion with regard to the desirability of offering some reasonable inducement to subaltern officers and men who have served as captains say 15 or 10 years in the service, in the shape of a lump sum of money if it suited them to retire ?—I have no doubt that it would create promotion, and that many would accept it. I presume that you mean some graduated scale according to the length of service.

2976. It must be in relation to the length of service no doubt, but you think that it would be accepted by many, and would not it be a favourable way of opening promotion to the ranks below ?—I think so, undoubtedly, and it would be an advantage if in that scale foreign service had an advantage over home service.

2977. You would make a marked distinction, would you, in that respect ?—Yes, certainly.

2978. Would you maintain the sort of ratio which has been hitherto acted upon in that respect ?—Yes, if two years at home counted for one year foreign, that would be a fair ratio.

2979. With regard to promotion generally, would you say that promotion ought to go by seniority in the regiment, subject, of course, to the selection of the Commander-in-Chief or by seniority in the army or in the arm of the service ?—I should take the regiment as the unit of promotion, but with exceptions in order to try and equalise promotion.

2980. You would be of opinion, would you, that equalised promotion is a more desirable thing than that sort of irregular promotion which depends upon chance, and which brings some men forward very early, and others not until somewhat later ?—I think so; it is a matter of opinion, of course, but that is my opinion.

2981. Do you think that it would be most satisfactory to the army ?—I think so.

2982. Provided they understand that their position is not affected by anything but the casualties of the service, are they not tolerably satisfied with an unequal system ?—I do not think so; I think if a man of very long standing himself goes into a garrison town and finds others of half his service senior to him that renders him dissatisfied.

2983. Do you think that the general opinion of the army is that they would prefer some system of an equalised rate of promotion rather than the present system ?—Yes, I think so.

2984. How would you achieve that; would you do anything like that which I was pointing at; would you make the questions one of army seniority ?—I think it might be done in this way : some officers prefer serving in their own regiments, and would rather remain waiting on for promotion to get it in their own regiment than to take it in the army at large. I would consult their wishes and let them remain ; but in the case of another man who is more ambitious and prefers getting on rather than keeping with his friends in his old regiment, and says that he will take army service, provided he has had the qualifying number of years' service, I would let him have the advantage of taking it in another regiment, and the man who preferred remaining in his regiment let him remain there ; as far as their wishes could be consulted compatibly with the interests of the service, I would do so, and it is done to a certain extent, I think, as it was in the olden days of purchase. A man formerly might record his name as wishing purchase specially in his regiment or in the service at large, and that might be done now, though without purchase.

2985. You do not suggest anything different to what you say is done now ?—I should do it more largely.

2986. You would more largely bring in what I may call strangers into the regiments ?—Yes.

2987. Keeping however regimental seniority as the general rule ?—Precisely so.

2988. Do you think that the examinations for the Staff College or any other test of intellectual merit that may be proposed could be advantageously adopted as a means of securing promotion to a man ? Do you, I mean, think it would be possible to inaugurate any system under which intellectual attainment, tested by the Staff College, or any other method, should give a man the right to quicker promotion ?—I should be very chary of doing so on account of the difficulties, it being notorious that men who pass the best examinations at the Staff College by no means invariably, and as a matter of course, prove to be the best staff officers.

2989. As regards the regimental officers, do they prove better regimental officers than the others ?—I should be very sorry to say that they prove better, but they certainly cannot prove worse, because information—the information that he must acquire at the Staff College—is always useful to any man.

2990. Do you see any marked superiority as to regimental officers in those that have gone through any of this special training ?—I have not come across a sufficient number closely to be able to answer that question.

2991. With regard to the Staff College you did not pass through it yourself ?—No, I passed through the Senior Department which existed before the present Staff College was formed.

2992. With regard to brevet some suggestions have been made to the Commission with regard to the offering for distinguished service some other reward than that which is given by brevet, do you think there is any other reward which would be acceptable to the army or so acceptable ?—I scarcely know the nature of the reward to which the question alludes.

2993. Various things have been suggested, for instance, a decoration has been suggested, or a sum of money in the nature of good service pension, or the two united. What would be your opinion with regard to that subject ?—I think it a good idea, the decoration carrying with it some graduated scale of pension.

2994. Like the Legion of Honour in France ?—Yes, that would be far fairer to the officers at large than brevet promotion.

2995. Still you would not do away with brevet

promotion, I presume, because it offers an opportunity of bringing forward the deserving men?—Yes, and for that reason it should be kept on.

2996. Do you think that brevet promotion has been somewhat lavishly distributed of late years?—In the opinion of some people I believe that is the case.

2997. Are you one of those who think so?—Yes.

2998. If a man is passed over in his regiment for promotion, do you think he ought to remain in his regiment?—No.

2999. You think that he ought to retire?—It is a harsh measure to suggest; but if a man is not fit for promotion he should not be passed over by his juniors, but should be compelled to retire.

3000. Do you think that a man ceases to be thoroughly efficient from the mere fact of his being shown unfit to be promoted?—I think the German system is an excellent one in that respect.

3001. What is that?—If a man is passed over once he must take that as a hint to prepare himself for final retirement. If he takes the hint and does retire, there is no slur cast upon him; but if not, and he is passed over a second time, I believe he is at once placed upon half-pay; there is no option left him.

3002. We have had some suggestions about altering the organisation of our regiments, and creating double companies, and putting a certain number of the captains into the position of major; have you thought about that at all?—I cannot say that I have very much; it has only very lately been brought to my notice.

3003. Supposing such a thing were done, it has been suggested to us that there are a good many regimental duties which devolve upon the captains at present which would not perhaps be very cheerfully or willingly performed by persons in the position of field officers?—Knowing nothing of the details of the proposed scheme, it is difficult for me to answer. In one respect of course it would be beneficial, because, as I understand it, it would necessarily give an increased number of field officers promotion.

3004. I am speaking of it as a question of organisation?—Knowing nothing of the proposed details, I can scarcely answer the question.

3005. Speaking of the matter purely in what may be called a military point of view, do you think that the system of a double company commanded by a major would in the field be as efficient as the present system?—Yes.

3006. You would not reduce, I suppose, the whole number of officers belonging to a battalion, would you?—No, I do think that there are too many officers for the work as the work is carried on.

3007. In the field, do you think that one man having command as it were of 200, men would be as satisfactory as the present system of single companies commanded by captains?—Yes, more so, for now if there are two companies working together they are necessarily under the command of the senior officer of the two, and, practically, by appointing a major, it would be simply carrying out the present system in a more efficient manner.

3008. And as far as service, before the enemy is concerned, actual service in the field, you think that double companies would not be an unwieldy unit, but the reverse?—Just so.

3009. With regard to the double battalion, are you in favour of the system of a free exchange between those double battalions?—If by a double battalion I understand you to mean a linked battalion, I think so.

3010. But at present there are some regiments with double battalions, are there not?—Yes, my own is one, we have four battalions, and the result of that is to stop exchanges outside of us, we rarely exchange to another regiment because we can exchange from one battalion into another.

3011. Is that a good thing?—Yes, unquestionably it is a good thing, because you exchange without losing your regimental position.

3012. You mean that you do not go to the bottom of your rank, as you would if you went into another regiment?—Precisely so.

3013. In that aspect of the matter, would the system of linked battalions be desirable?—I think so, certainly.

3014. It would facilitate exchanges without any drawbacks?—Yes.

3015. Do you think the system of local rank a desirable one?—It is a desirable one, and in fact necessary in India. At the same time it places a man in a position in which I do not think he ought to be placed, because he takes up one day a superior title and he has to drop it in the next.

3016. You say that there is an anomaly about it?—Yes, in that way that a man one day may be styled a lieutenant-colonel, and on embarking on board ship he may drop down to major again. I do not think that a proper position to place a man in.

3017. If the same result and if the necessities of the case could be met in some other way, you think it would be desirable to do so?—Yes.

3018. Let me take your mind back for a moment to the question of promotion and compulsory retirement; what would you think of a system with regard, for instance, to captains under which it was regulated that if a captain did not obtain promotion after a certain number of years' service, say 20 or any other number that might be fixed upon, he should cease to be eligible for promotion to a majority, but should not be obliged to retire, but might remain on as captain in his regiment for any given number of years, say five or six years more if he liked; is that a system which you think would work?—I can only answer that from individual feeling, that I would not like it. If I were once passed over, I should be inclined to go altogether rather than remain on.

3019. I take it for granted that under such a system there are many men who would say, I have passed so many years in my regiment, and if I cannot get promotion I would rather not remain, but would go; but suppose a man said, I should like to remain one year, or five or six years longer, would there be any detriment to the service in his doing so?—No absolute detriment, but I think it would be so exceptional that I should not be disposed to legislate for it.

3020. You can conceive of course that a man so placed might be discontented and might infuse a bad spirit into the regiment, and so forth, is there any ground for apprehending that, do you think?—If a man specially wished it, I would not interfere with his wish, but I do not think it would be generally accepted.

3021. You think that under such a system when the period was reached beyond which he could not expect promotion he would go?—Yes, and on the whole it would be advisable that he should go.

3022. And it would be better to have it a compulsory retirement at that period?—Yes.

3023. Under a general rule of that sort an individual would have no ground for thinking himself slighted, or passed over or anything of that kind, he would simply be regarded as an unfortunate man in his promotion; he would have arrived at a certain age and a certain period of service and not got promotion, and therefore there would be no slur upon him?—It might sooth his feelings to give him an option in the matter.

3024. And if it soothed his feelings, do you think there would be any detriment to the service in his being allowed to do that?—No, not for a reasonable time. I would not allow a man to hang on for ever.

3025. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) With regard to your own experience, how long were you a subaltern?—It was 9½ years; I was not in the Rifle brigade at the time.

3026. You exchanged into the Rifle brigade, did you not?—No, I got my promotion during the Crimean war for long service, and I got a company in the Rifle brigade.

3027. How long were you a captain in the Rifle brigade?—I was from 1855 to 1868, 13 years.

3028. Is that about the average rise in the Rifle

Lieut.-Col. Maclean.

11 May 1875.

brigade?—It is very difficult to state the average, the average was so much affected by the Crimean war and by the subsequent stagnation. It always has been a slow regiment, but owing to the Crimean war of course companies were got very rapidly indeed. Since that, too, we have been augmented. My own case was one in point, being brought into it in 1855, it took me 13 years to get to the top of the captains, having been for purchase, and never passed over.

3029. A number of young men got in in that way, which rather stopped the flow of promotion?—Yes.

3030. You said something of your having been rather unfortunate in your progress in promotion; what did you mean precisely by that?—I consider that a man who has been 30 years before he obtains the command of a battalion is necessarily unfortunate.

3031. How long were you a major?—Since 1868, seven years.

3032. With regard to the lieutenant-colonel whom you succeeded, did he go out under the five years' rule?—No, he died.

3033. When you speak of promotion by way of seniority rather going throughout the army generally than in the regiment, I did not understand that you would treat the whole line as one regiment as the artillery is, but that you would correct the inequalities in a regiment which are very salient in the way of rapid promotion by introducing officers from other regiments where the inequalities are the other way?—I fear that I must have been misunderstood if you imagined that I was in favour of promotion throughout the army generally, I distinctly said that I would make the regiment the unit of promotion, with exceptional cases outside it.

3034. Did you specify what those exceptional cases were?—I endeavoured to do so. A man of long service, say, at the top of the list of lieutenants, wishes to remain in his regiment; I would let him do so. A man with shorter service says no, I will take promotion in another regiment; I would let him do so. That would create exceptions, and those exceptions would tend to equalise the flow of promotion throughout the army, but yet it would not destroy the regimental system of promotion.

3035. As regards the regiment into which he would go, to that extent you would interfere with the regiment?—Yes, I would to that extent, because some regiments have lieutenants of eight or nine years' standing, and others have them of 15 or 16 years' standing. If you take a man who has been 16 years in a regiment and put him as captain into another regiment where there are the eight years' lieutenants, that equalises the promotions, and does not leave the lieutenants of eight years' standing much cause of complaint.

3036. Do not you think that in many regiments it would be considered rather a hardship if lieutenants were brought in upon them in that way with disadvantages to their chances of promotion?—Yes, all those cases entail hardships on individuals, but it is done, as I say, in the service now, and I would extend its operation. I do not think it is sufficiently done to equalise the promotion.

3037. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) In answering Lord Penzance just now you alluded to a service which should qualify a man for promotion. I understand from that that you think that certain periods of service ought to be passed before a man can get promoted. Will you state what is your opinion as to the minimum service which would qualify for promotion to the rank of captain in his own regiment? Supposing, for instance, that there is a vacant company in a regiment, and the senior lieutenant is a man of too short a period of service to be considered to have a claim to that company, what period would you lay down at which he should qualify for promotion?—I should say six years.

3038. You would not promote a man if he had not had six years' service as a subaltern?—No.

3039. Then going on from captain to major, what service would you consider necessary before you would make him a major?—From the time of his entering the service I should say double that, from 12 to 13.

3040. In alluding to the Staff College, have you not from your experience seen that officers who have passed the Staff College on rejoining their regiments are discontented and dissatisfied with regimental work, whilst they are waiting for employment as staff officers?—I think that at this moment there are only two in my regiment so situated, and therefore I cannot answer that question from personal knowledge.

3041. But referring to the regimental esprit, which I imagine is rather strong in the Rifle brigade, do not you think that it would be very much broken in upon and injured by any very extended system of bringing in men to equalise the promotion?—By the regimental esprit, if you mean what is commonly called *esprit de corps*, speaking of the Rifle brigade as a regiment, we never should dread that; our service is always so slow, and we are never afraid of anybody being brought in over us.

3042. Speaking from your knowledge of other regiments what would you say?—I do not think myself that bringing in a man occasionally does any harm to any regiment.

3043. Going to the question of double companies; under the present system of arms of precision, you are aware that it will be necessary in future wars for field officers to be dismounted. Do you think that a dismounted man can efficiently command under fire an extended opened-out body of men of from 200 to 250 strong?—Not by his own voice alone, but if he is backed up by intelligent supernumeraries and other officers he might. It has been done, and I presume can be done again.

3044. With regard to local rank, what local rank did you obtain in India?—That of lieutenant-colonel.

3045. Speaking of your own feelings, would you rather that the system was not in operation under which local rank was given?—Yes.

3046. Would you rather that the system had not been introduced?—No, I think it is good to a certain extent by placing you on an equality with those who are serving with you in the country. But it had this drawback that I was one day given the rank, and the next day I had to resign it; the result being that although as a precautionary measure I took the rank that was offered me, I never used it.

3047. But it tended to remove dissatisfaction in India on account of the supersession which occurred owing to the system of promotion in the Indian army?—To a certain extent, undoubtedly.

3048. It was brought in with that object?—Entirely.

3049. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) You passed the senior department, did you not?—Yes.

3050. And you returned to your regiment?—Yes.

3051. Were you dissatisfied with the regimental service afterwards?—No.

3052. Then you do not anticipate that another man would be dissatisfied?—I do not see why he should be.

3053. Supposing that eight years were the term that a subaltern must serve before he could become a captain, and that it was decided that after eight years' service subalterns should obtain any regimental promotion which might occur, do you not think if the senior subaltern had not eight years' service, it would be advisable and fair to promote an old subaltern from another regiment?—I am not disposed to pass over a man of very long service in favour of that view. If there was a man of eight years' service qualified and fit in every way, and another man of 14, I would bring in the man of 14 in preference.

3054. (*Maj.-General Foster.*) You stated that you see the advantage of the system of exchange in a regiment that had two battalions or more?—Yes; the advantage to the individual consisting in the fact that exchanging in a double battalion regiment he does not lose his regimental position.

3055. And that you think an advantage to the

Lieut.-Col Maclean.

11 May 1875

officer and to the service?—I am not prepared to say that it is an advantage to the service, but to the officers certainly it is.

3056. You take this view of it, that an officer who had passed the examination in the higher standard of education in languages in India, if he is in a single battalion having qualified himself for staff employment in India if he wishes to keep his staff appointment in India, must go as the junior of his rank, whereas in a regiment with two battalions he might exchange without losing the rank that was given for his service in India?—I think that is a decided advantage to the man, and no detriment to the service.

3057. You have also stated that you think it would be advisable to have the same rule introduced in linked battalions; and you are aware that all the new officers who have joined the army since purchase has been abolished will have that advantage in future according to the present regulation. What I want to ask you is whether you think it would be any hardship to the officers of linked battalions if that rule was introduced at once, so that officers could exchange from one linked battalion to another without losing their place in the regiment?—I see none; if it is to be done at all it might as well be done now as 10 years hence.

3058. You think that the officers would have no real ground of complaint if it was introduced at once?—I would not undertake to say that they would not complain, but I do not see that it is any ground for complaint. I give that answer on the supposition that these linked battalions must necessarily be placed on one list before the exchange could be effected, otherwise I do not see how it could be done.

3059. Are you aware of the number of colonels irrespective of staff officers in the army who are qualified for promotion to the rank of major-general?—I do not know.

3060. If you found that the number was 275, and it is calculated that 10 per cent. of those are likely to serve, and that five per cent. of that list die, and that the actuaries have calculated that of the 275 generals there ought to be 25 vacancies a year (and in one year there have been 28), you would not think it possible that so long a period as 14 years would elapse from a man attaining the rank of lieutenant-colonel to be coming a general officer?—I cannot answer that question off hand, but I still stick stoutly to what I started with, the Army List as my guide.

3061. (*Chairman.*) In speaking of the time which you expect a lieutenant-colonel or a colonel would have to wait for the position of major-general you are looking back to past experience?—Yes, I do not think it is likely to be less.

3062. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) As commanding officer of your battalion you have to make confidential reports about all your officers in your battalion, have you not?—I shall have to do so. I have never had to do it yet.

3063. Supposing you were called upon in one of those reports to name the particular officers in your battalion who you thought promised or were likely to be efficient staff officers, should you have any difficulty in giving those names or selecting them?—Not the slightest, any more than I would have in selecting a man who I thought would be likely to make a good adjutant.

3064. You would be able to say, So-and-so are promising officers and likely to be efficient staff officers if they were selected?—Yes, without the slightest difficulty.

The witness withdrew.

Maj. Hudson.

Major James Hudson examined.

3065. (*Chairman.*) To what regiment do you belong?—I belong to the 84th.

3066. How many years' service have you?—20½ years.

3067. And how long have you held the majority?—Curiously enough I am two days senior as major to Colonel Maclean.

3068. In what year did you get your major's commission?—In April 1868.

3069. How old are you now?—37.

3070. You have heard Colonel Maclean's evidence; is there any special matter in which you differ from him, or do you generally agree with him?—Generally I agree with him.

3071. With regard to the system of promotion, do you think it should be by regimental seniority, subjec to this, that where promotion had gone very quick in a regiment and the next officer for a vacancy had had an exceptionally short number of years' service, some one should be brought in from another regiment?—I think that it would depend a good deal upon what had caused the rapid promotion in that regiment. In the case of a war, or in the case of serving in the West Indies, where great sickness occasionally exists, I think then that no matter how young the officers you had got, having stood the brunt of it, they ought to get the promotion.

3072. They would look upon it as rather hard that having stood the climate and having fortunately been successful in avoiding the ill effects of it, some one else should have the promotion?—Certainly.

3073. Still, generally, you are prepared to accept that system if it is necessary and if it is worked with discretion?—Provided that a senior officer of the rank in the army was given it; but nothing makes so much unpleasantness in a regiment as a man coming into it for apparently no reason whatever, getting promoted into it in fact. My regiment is a case in point at the present moment.

3074. There being a vacancy, and the senior lieutenant in the regiment being of exceptionally short service; if, then, according to some fixed rule of seniority some one was brought in from without, that would not be objected to?—No.

3075. But if some one was brought in without the regiment being able to account precisely for why he was selected, there would be an objection?—Certainly. A captain in my regiment died at the end of last year, and a lieutenant of another regiment of not very long service, a junior to the senior lieutenant in my regiment, was promoted into it. He was, moreover, not senior lieutenant in his own regiment, so that his own regiment was dissatisfied, and my regiment was dissatisfied.

3076. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Are the Commission to understand that there was no obvious or apparent reason why that was done?—There was no obvious reason, except so far as this; that his regiment had been to Ashantee, but he was not the senior lieutenant of his regiment.

3077. (*Maj.-General Herbert.*) He was the adjutant of his regiment, was he not?—Yes.

3078. And a very good officer?—Yes, a very good officer. Do not understand me to say that we have any objection to him as a companion or as an officer, because we are very fond of him, he is an excellent officer.

3079. (*Lord Hampton.*) Did I understand you to say that he was junior to your senior lieutenant?—Yes; and he had, I think, five lieutenants in his own regiment senior to him, that was the curious part of it.

3080. (*Chairman.*) That was pure selection?—Yes, that was pure selection.

3081. If an officer is passed over in the regiment, do you agree with Colonel Maclean that he ought to retire?—Certainly. In the case of the senior lieutenant in my regiment undoubtedly the promotion did not go in the regiment, because he had been reported

Maj. Hudson.
11 May 1875.

unfavourably upon, and he certainly ought to go if it is for that reason.

3082. You think a man ceases to become thoroughly efficient?—I think that a man who would stay in the regiment under those circumstances cannot do the service any good.

3083. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Was that the case to which you have been already referring?—Yes.

3084. Then it was not an apparently capricious exercise of authority?—No; we understood why it was.

3085. (*Chairman.*) What do you say about the suggestion of offering a pecuniary reward to a man coupled with a decoration as a reward for distinguished service?—I think that that would be very much better than giving a brevet.

3086. Would you carry it to the extent of doing away with brevet altogether?—Yes.

3087. You would not reserve brevet as a means of bringing forward a young officer of distinction, enabling him afterwards to get a higher command?—I think that he might be promoted in other ways if his merit was great.

3088. He might receive unattached promotion?—Yes.

3089. Or he might at once be selected as in the case of the man you have mentioned?—He might. This was a case in point.

3090. Therefore you would do away with brevet altogether?—Yes, I would do away with brevet altogether, provided some substitute were found for it in the case of distinguished service.

3091. With regard to the principle of retirement generally, do you agree in the desirability of maintaining the five years' rule for the command of a regiment?—Yes, I do, not because it would benefit me, seeing that my colonel is not under rule, so that I have no object in saying so, but I think it is a good rule.

3092. Do you agree that a man in the position of lieutenant-colonel, who had served his five years, would be likely to take reasonable retirement at the end of that five years in place of going on half pay if the option were offered to him?—I think that it would be to his advantage to do so.

3093. That would tend very much, would it not, to clear the list of those who were waiting to become generals on the generals' establishment?—That would depend. Amongst the present purchase officers who are in the position of lieutenant-colonels, most of them are poor men, and they must have their money back.

3094. I am not alluding to the past but alluding to the future race of colonels?—I think it would be better for them to take the pension.

3095. With regard to the great block which takes places at the head of the captains' list, do you think that that might be dealt with by compulsory retirement after a certain number of years' service?—I think it would be a most excellent thing.

3096. Have you fixed upon any period in your mind which you think would do?—I should say after 25 years' service there should be compulsory retirement.

3097. You would have, would you not, an optional retirement at an earlier period of service?—If you could induce them to retire at an earlier period it would be much better.

3098. The purchase system did offer that sort of inducement, did it not, and many thousands went out early?—Undoubtedly.

3099. Do you think it would be desirable to follow the purchase system in that respect, and offer some lump sum of money to the man to go out an earlier period?—I do.

3100. For instance, supposing a sum of 1,200*l.* after 15 years' service were offered, how do you think that would operate, 1,800*l.* being the regulation value of a captain's commission?—I have not in my own mind fixed any sum. I have not thought about it.

3101. What do you say to the suggestion that I put to Colonel Maclean, of drawing a line, and saying after 20 years' service, or any other period that might be fixed, you cannot be promoted any further; you cannot be promoted to a majority and go forward, but notwithstanding that you may, if you like, remain as captain of your regiment for another five or six or seven years. Would that be acceptable?—No. I think that a man ought not to be allowed to stay on.

3102. What is your reason for that?—I think that when a man has become too old, and the service requires him to retire, I would not give him permission, although he might be willing to serve on. I do not think that that is a man who will do the service much good.

3103. You will understand that such a system as I am hinting at would not be based upon the supposition that the man was too old to do the work, but upon the supposition that you must obtain a flow of promotion, and that although a man may be quite young enough to do the duty of major, yet that he would become old by the time he reached the rank of major-general?—No; but in the army we have such an objection to being passed over, that I think a man whose feelings were so blunted as not to care about being passed over will not do much good.

3104. Would he look upon it as being passed over if it was the result of an absolute rule, if he understood when he entered the army that he was to go if he was not lucky enough to reach the rank of major before he had 20 years' service?—I can only answer from my own feelings; if it was done to me I would go to-morrow.

3105. Supposing another person did not feel the same but stayed on, would it be a detriment to the service?—I should feel if I did that, that I should not care how I did my work.

3106. Then you would become inefficient?—I should become inefficient undoubtedly, but every one is not of the same temperament as I am.

3107. You say that in general you agree with what Colonel Maclean has been stating?—Generally I do.

3108. (*Lord Hampton.*) Have you formed any opinion upon the questions that were put to Colonel Maclean with regard to altering the organisation of the regiments, so as to have the double companies and field officers to command them?—It is a very large question to enter into, and I do not know whether your Lordship means the barrack room, or in the internal organisation, or interior economy of the regiment, or simply in the field?

3109. I am speaking of the organisation of the regiment, chiefly, of course, with reference to its service in the field. Looking at the organisation and the working of the regiment, would you think it would be an improvement to have double companies and squadrons as the units in the place of its present companies and troops. Thus, in the infantry, would you think it an improvement, instead of having eight separate companies as they now, are to have four companies with a major and a captain to each company?—I think that the present organisation is the best.

3110. May I ask why?—I think it is as much as one man can look after. What he has got now, particularly if the regiment is augmented.

3111. When you say "as much as one man could look after" do you contemplate service in the field or service at home?—Both. The captain of a company has a great deal to do if he does his work properly, he has the payment of his company, and the accounts are rather complicated. He really is the paymaster of the company. The paymaster of the regiment certainly hands him out the money, but he is really the paymaster of the company and that in addition to to his other duties is as much as he can do. If he had two sets of men he could not do it properly.

3112. I presume you are aware that the organisation to which I am now referring is the organisation of most of the Foreign armies in Europe?—I believe it is the organisation of the artillery too, they have very much the same duties to do.

3113. You are aware, I presume, that England is the only country in Europe in which in the cavalry

the troop is the unit instead of the squadron?—I believe it is.

3114. But that fact does not affect your opinion?—No, I am not aware of how the foreign armies pay their men, whether they do it through the paymaster of the battalion as in the marines, or whether they do it through the captain.

3115. Looking only to action in the field under fire, would it be your opinion that a double company would be more than an officer could efficiently take the command of?—Certainly, if he had to take command of the whole double company at the same time.

3116. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You suggest, I think, that a substantive promotion should be substituted for brevet promotion as a reward for service in the field?—Not exactly. I said that if you want to pay particular distinction to one man you might do it, but I did not suggest that it should be altogether substituted. My suggestion was that a decoration and an annuity should be given.

3117. Then you do not approve of that principle of substantive promotion as a reward for service in the field being carried to any large extent?—No.

3118. Because it could hardly be effective without causing hardship to the men in the regiment over whom this man was brought?—No, it would cause hardship.

3119. (*Chairman.*) And it would interfere with regimental promotion?—Yes, it would; but you need not necessarily promote him in the regiment, you might give him unattached promotion.

3120. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is there not an impression in the army that in order to obtain promotion by brevet interest is required, and would not that objection be removed if all applications or claims for promotion by brevet were sifted by a committee before they were submitted to the Commander-in-Chief?—There certainly is that impression in the army, but as to whether the applications being sifted by a committee would be any advantage, I cannot offer an opinion, but there is that impression.

3121. (*Chairman.*) With regard to compulsory retirements or voluntary retirements which, of course, would have relation to length of service, do you agree with the last witness in thinking that the length of service ought to be calculated at two years' home being equal to one year foreign?—I think it would be very fair to do so.

3122. You approve of the mode of looking upon one year foreign as worth two years' home?—Yes, for retirement I do.

3123. (*Lord Hampton.*) With regard to your views upon brevet, is it your opinion that the system suggested to you of decoration with a good service pension in lieu of brevet would be satisfactory to the army?—I think it would to the majority of the army for this reason, that by the fact of giving a man brevet rank you promote him probably over the heads of some of his seniors and if you give him a decoration and a pension, he raises himself to the detriment of no one else.

3124. (*Chairman.*) And therefore it has that advantage over the brevet system?—Quite so.

The witness withdrew.

Captain Charles Borton examined.

3125. (*Chairman.*) To what regiment do you belong?—To the 14th.

3126. How long have you held a company?—I have held a company since 1866; that is nine years.

3127. How many years' service have you?—Twenty-one years. I am not senior captain, but I have exchanged. I was not always in the 14th regiment. If I had been in my own regiment I should now have been seventh captain from the top.

3128. What are you now in the 14th regiment?—I am not quite certain, but I think I am about 14th or 15th; it is a two battalion regiment.

3129. Do you agree in what we have been told generally by the previous witnesses as to the system of promotion?—Yes, mostly; but I think that as regards promotion from captain to major, there ought to be a general list, and it ought to be promotion generally through the army, taking seniority as the basis.

3130. You think that the step from captain to major ought to go according to army seniority—Yes, it ought, I think.

3131. Do you mean the entire army, including all branches of it, or do you mean the arm of the service?—The infantry arm of the service.

3132. You would have a list of captains for the whole infantry, and when a vacancy occurred in the majority you would give it to the senior captain on that list?—Yes, if he were qualified.

3133. In preference to giving it to the regimental captain?—Yes.

3134. What is your reason for that?—I do not refer so much to the step of lieutenant to captain as from captain to major. I think it would not interfere with the regimental system, and it would do no harm. It would certainly be much better for officers of long service, and who have no chance of getting on in any other way.

3135. Have you heard these things talked about in the regiment, and is that the general opinion?—In our regiment it is, and I think from what I hear outside it is generally the opinion.

3136. It is generally the opinion that it would help on what may be called unfortunate captains, but do you not think it would break in upon the regimental system to an extent which would be detrimental?—I should on the whole, be in favour of it for army of future; I am not talking of those at present serving.

3137. Then would you deal with the step from major to lieutenant-colonel in the same way?—Yes, in the same way.

3138. Of course compulsory retirement is not a desirable thing if it can be avoided; but seeing that there is a block at the head of the captains' list, owing to the small number of majors, do you think it would be a good plan to adopt it?—I quite agree with what has been said before, namely, compulsory retirement after 25 years' service.

3139. What do you say to the suggestion that has been made as to a captain after 20 years' service being ineligible for promotion, but being allowed to remain on as captain for another five years, supposing he wished it?—I am inclined to agree with Major Hudson in thinking that a man would be inefficient, that is, I do not think he would care very much for his duty.

3140. I suppose you consider that when a man is passed over he ought to retire?—He ought certainly to retire if he is passed over for inefficiency.

3141. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) You would not give him a second chance?—Certainly not.

3142. (*Chairman.*) As to brevet, what do you say about substituting decoration and a pension?—I quite agree with that. I think that brevet ought to be abolished.

3143. You think that the other system would be acceptable to the army?—Yes, I think it would.

3144. Do you approve of transferring very distinguished officers to other regiments by direct promotion?—Yes.

3145. What is the feeling, as far as you know, about brevet; has it been discussed in the army?—I think it is a very general feeling, and everyone that I have talked to about it agrees with me; they do not like brevet.

3146. They have the feeling, have they not, that it

Captain C. Borton.

11 May 1875.

has been too lavishly bestowed of late years?—There is a very strong feeling about it.

3147. (*Lord Hampton.*) It excites jealousy, does it not?—Yes, it excites jealousy.

3148. (*Chairman.*) With reference to promotion it has been suggested that when a man has had only a limited number of years' service, say six years, or whatever it may be, as lieutenant, he should be disqualified from obtaining a company, and if it is on that account somebody should be brought in from without, do you agree with that?—I do. I think that some limit ought to be fixed.

3149. That a man of longer service substituted for one of shorter service in the regiment?—Yes.

3150. But would you qualify that as Major Hudson did by referring to a cause which would occasion promotion, for instance, if it was occasioned by death in an unhealthy climate?—Yes; I certainly think that that qualification ought to be made.

3151. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Looking at the Army List, I see that the 14th regiment is rather an unfortunate one; all the captains are of long service?—Yes, that is so.

3152. That may in some degree affect their feeling as regards the introduction of a system of promotion by length of service or standing, because it would be advantageous to the 14th to introduce that system; but supposing it was a regiment that had been fortunate they would have a different idea upon the subject, would they not?—I am talking of the army of the future. I think that any old captain for a certain number of years would like to get his promotion in due course; he knows that there was an average time to serve before getting his rank. I was not talking about the captains in the 14th regiment at the time.

3153. You say that you know that it is the feeling in that regiment, but do not you think that that feeling may have been rather induced by their having been unfortunate, and seeing other regiments much more lucky in promotion?—I should think that the older captains would have that feeling, but then of course I think that this plan would be a better one for all the juniors.

3154. It would be popular in an unfortunate regiment but not in a fortunate regiment, you think?—I do not think that in the future it will make so much difference, now that purchase is done away with, and regimental promotion is generally much slower; it would not make so much difference.

3155. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Is there any reason why bringing an officer into a regiment by promotion or selection would interfere with the regimental feeling and system more than allowing officers from other regiments to exchange into that regiment?—Not generally, I should say.

3156. Are the exchanges numerous in regiments going to India?—Very.

3157. Have you any idea how many men exchanged into the regiment to which you belonged before it went to India?—I think there were five or six captains, I am not quite sure.

3158. Does any feeling exist against officers who go through the Staff College?—No personal feeling. The officers do not like to do their duty when they are away, that is all.

3159. Am I right in saying that this feeling arises not from an objection to seeing officers improve themselves, but from the knowledge that the officers who remain in the regiment have to do the duty of those who go to the Staff College?—Yes, that is so.

3160. And if those officers were seconded that feeling would be done away with?—It would have no place at all, I think.

The witness withdrew.

Captain Thomas Carroll Dempster examined.

Captain T. C. Dempster.

3161. (*Chairman.*) To what regiment do you belong?—The 24th.

3162. How long have you held a company?—Since last June.

3163. How many years' service have you?—Fourteen.

3164. Do you agree with what the previous witnesses have been telling the Commission as to the feeling of the army with reference to promotion?—Yes; I think that general promotion throughout the service would be preferable to regimental promotion.

3165. Would you abolish the system of regimental seniority as the basis of promotion?—Yes.

3166. And you would establish a general list for each branch of the service?—Yes, I think that would be fairer.

3167. And give promotion in that general list?—Yes.

3168. That would no doubt render promotion much more equal?—Yes, that is what I mean, and I think it would be very desirable.

3169. Do you think that many of your fellow officers think so?—Some do.

3170. Perhaps the majority are rather the other way?—Yes; those who are at the top of the list at present, and who expect their promotion soon would not like it.

3171. With regard to compulsory retirement, what do you think of that?—I agree with what has been said about it.

3172. Do you agree also that a system of voluntary retirement would be accepted amongst subaltern officers, if reasonable terms were offered?—I think so.

3173. What is your opinion about brevet?—I think it ought to be done away with.

3174 In the way suggested by the other witnesses?—Yes.

3175. You would substitute for it some other method?—Yes; by decoration for particularly distinguished service, and by actual promotion.

3176. Has that been a matter which you have heard discussed much; is that a general feeling amongst the officers do you think?—Yes, throughout my regiment it is.

3177. What do you say about altering the system of organization of the company?—I think it would be an advantage if the companies were strong to have a field officer commanding the troops.

3178. The suggestion is to do away with a certain number of captains, in fact to make a certain number of captains majors, and let them command a double company?—I think that would be an advantage, particularly in the field, where two companies work together, that there ought to be one in command of two of them.

3179. Are there not certain purely regimental routine duties that devolve upon the captain at present at home?—Yes.

3180. Would a field officer be willing to perform all those duties?—I do not think that he would in the way of regimental duties.

3181. He would feel them beneath him rather, as matters of interior economy?—Yes.

3182. But in the field do you think it would be an advantage?—Yes, I think it would.

3183. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) The majors of artillery have to perform the same duties of interior economy as the captains of the line, have they not?—Yes.

3184. Have you ever heard them complain that there was anything below their dignity in performing those duties?—No, I never heard the question mooted at all; but I think that there are certain duties performed in a regiment by captains that majors might not like doing.

The witness withdrew.

Lieutenant PAUL SWINBURNE examined.

3185. (*Chairman.*) What regiment are you in?—In the 80th regiment.

3186. How many years' service have you?—I have been nearly 16 years in the army; but my service has practically not begun yet.

3187. Why do you say that your service has not begun yet?—Because as a lieutenant a man's service has not begun, until he is a captain he is eligible for nothing.

3188. Have you heard what the other officers have stated to the Commission?—Yes.

3189. Do you agree generally with their conclusions, or are there any points upon which you entertain a different opinion?—I do not agree entirely with some of them. With regard to what Major Hudson, for instance, said, I would give them a second chance.

3190. If a man were passed over once you would give him a second chance before requiring him to retire?—Yes, I think so, for this reason, that he might be exceedingly poor, and I would give him another chance, because, if retirement is to be compulsory at once in the first instance, it is ruin to a man in many cases. Major Hudson said that if it happened to him he should retire at once, but another man might not be in a position to do so, and therefore I would give him a second chance.

3191. Do you agree that promotion should be in the regiment, or do you think that it ought to be according to a general list of the whole branch of the service?—In my position it is very difficult to avoid a personal bias in a matter of that kind. It is exceedingly difficult to answer that question except from a personal point of view.

3192. You have been very unfortunate?—Yes; I am one of the most unfortunate officers in the service. I have never been passed over and I have never exchanged. I should like to see it general throughout the army certainly.

3193. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Are you the senior lieutenant?—No, I am not.

3194. How many have you got above you?—One, and he is in his 18th year of service.

3195. Is it owing to any peculiar circumstances that the promotion has been so slow in your regiment?—It has been owing to a combination of circumstances, some of which I can point out, and others which I only can guess at.

3196. Are the captains of very long service in the regiment?—Yes, they are.

3197. Do you know how many years' service the senior captain has?—21 years, but he is not the oldest captain in the corps. There is one regiment that I know where the captains are of longer service than ours, but only one of which I am aware.

3198. Any system by which, after a certain number of years' service, the captains were compulsorily retired, would in a case like yours relieve you and give you a chance of getting on?—Were the system of retirement fixed at 25 years' service for a man who was made a captain, of course there is nothing can help me on. I am simply out of it.

3199. You probably never would have been in the position that you now are if such a system had been in operation in your regiment?—No, certainly not.

3200. (*Chairman.*) You think it would prevent the recurrence of such a case as yours?—I think it would.

3201. And you think that that would be a good system?—Yes, I do. In fact it is the only way out of the difficulty. I look upon it that I am in such a position that nothing can possibly help me now.

3202. Do you agree also that a system of voluntary retirement with a sum of money would be a desirable thing to induce men to leave before they are captains?—I do not think it would be accepted by many. Men do not like leaving the service as subalterns as a rule.

3203. Under the purchase system a great many if not quite as many went out as lieutenants as captains?—They were men who only came in to make a pastime and a pleasure of the profession.

3204. There are a great many such men now, are there not?—There might be.

3205. Would you see any objection to it if men were willing?—I see no objection, but I do not think you would find many men to take it. There would be no harm in offering it certainly.

3206. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Have you the same feeling upon the subject of brevet rank as that which you have heard expressed by Colonel Maclean?—Yes, I have entirely.

3207. (*Chairman.*) Does that conform with what you have heard generally in the army?—I think it does. There are innumerable anomalies produced by brevet rank, and one constantly hears the impression of discontent which prevails, "How did so-and-so get his brevet?" "Why did he get it?" and so on, and it produces a great many anomalies. A man is captain in his own regiment, and lieutenant-colonel when he comes into a garrison town, and is then in command of his own regiment.

3208. Speaking generally, are there any points which you have heard discussed in the army, with reference to promotion and retirement, which you could mention as being things that the officers generally desire?—We hear it constantly discussed. It is the old money question, that is to say, the amount of retirement, that is what it all comes to.

3209. So far as you know have the officers at all fixed their minds up on any special mode of creating a regular flow of promotion?—I have not heard any discussed.

3210. There is no general feeling that you could give expression to?—I think that the general feeling would be in favour of compulsory retirement for al after a certain service in the rank of captain; that it should be an optional one at 20 years, and a compulsory one, say at 25, if the retiring pension was at all adequate, and if a difference was made between men who had purchased and men who had not.

3211. My question had reference entirely to the army of the future?—Then I think so, provided there was an adequate retirement.

3212. What do you fix upon as an adequate retirement in relation to his pay?—For a captain I should think if he got 250*l.* a year that would be the right sum.

3213. That would be more than his full pay?—Quite so. I do not see how you could expect a man to retire on anything short of that, *i.e.*, his full pay and allowances.

3214. After how many years' service?—Say that it was optional at 20 and compulsory at 25, if the same offer that was made him at 20.

3215. (*Mr. Welby.*) The same rate to be given at both times?—Yes.

3216. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You approve of the system of promotion in the army generally by length of service and seniority in the various ranks; have you contemplated at all the effect that that would have upon the regiment; would not there be a constant change of officers from one regiment to another?—There again you see my regiment is composed of such heterogeneous materials, that in point of fact it would not matter what you put into it now; it is made up of all regiments in the service, it could not be more mixed up than it is at present.

3217. We will speak apart from your own regiment; you must have seen other regiments in which there was the same mixture. Will you explain why your regiment is in this peculiar state to which you refer?—I cannot explain why it is. I only know that it is so.

3218. When you say that it is heterogeneous, what do you mean?—It is composed of officers of nearly all the regiments in the service, so many have been brought in from half-pay and from regiments that have been disbanded, and have been on half-pay and

Lieutenant P. Swinburne.

11 May 1875.

from exchanges. There are no less than seven captains, and neither of the majors began the service in the regiment. The colonel himself did not always belong to the regiment, although his case is hardly to the point because I believe he never served with his original regiment, but still he was not originally gazetted to the 80th.

3219. You do not consider that your regiment is an example in that respect of the army generally?—No, I think it is exceptional, certainly.

3220. Speaking from a point of view that is not exceptional, do you think it would be a good thing that officers should so constantly be moving about as inevitably must occur under the system that you propose?—I do not see that it does more harm than exchanges, excepting that the one is a voluntary act and the other is an involuntary one.

3221. It would be far more frequent, would it not?—It would be more frequent.

3222. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) What is your age?—I am nearly 36.

3223. Have you always been in the 80th?—Yes, always.

3224. Comparing the *esprit de corps* in your own regiment, of which you have spoken to us, with that in other regiments with which you must have been associated, is there any very material difference from the regimental feeling which you see in other regiments which have been less fed from alien sources?—That is a very difficult question to answer; when you remain only with your own regiment all your life, you cannot judge of the interior feeling of another regiment; you only see them at dinner or in society, and you do not know what personal feeling may be going on in the other regiments. There is a very strong family feeling amongst us, for the simple reason that many of us have been together so long, and that we pull well together.

3225. The condition of your regiment, as you describe it, is very much what that of any other regiment would be, if what you wish were introduced, if officers were brought in from all quarters?—It is not so much what I wish, but what I think would be a good thing for the army of the future.

3226. (*Mr. Welby.*) Did I understand you to say just now that you do not think that, in future, officers of means will come in, as has been the case before, to serve for a few years, and then retire?—No, I gave no opinion about that at all. I see no reason to suppose one way or the other.

The witness withdrew.

Lieutenant the Hon. G. Gough.

Lieutenant the Hon. GEORGE GOUGH examined.

3227. (*Chairman.*) Are you in the 14th Hussars?—Yes.

3228. How many years' service have you?—Three and a half.

3229. Then you came in since the purchase system was abolished?—Yes, just at the time that it was abolished.

3230. What is the feeling amongst the officers so far as you know, with regard to promotion and retirement in the future, as to how it should be brought about?—In my own regiment and in the cavalry generally there is very seldom a very long stick at the top. I do not think it is much discussed at all as to how people are to be got out of the way.

3231. You are looking forward of course to promotion in the regular course; in how many years in your regiment would you expect to get promoted to a troop?—As the case is now, I should think between five and seven years.

3232. Do you think that amongst the young men of your regiment that have joined there are a good many who may have joined without intending to remain in the army the greater part of their lives?—Certainly.

3233. Who intend to remain only for a time?—Yes, certainly.

3234. That is not an uncommon thing?—No.

3235. Do you intend to remain?—My own intention is to serve for a long time.

3236. Are there many who join now who have not that intention?—Yes, certainly.

3237. Since the abolition of purchase?—Yes, both before and after. I do not see that it has made the smallest difference.

3238. Not in the class of men?—Certainly not.

3239. Or in their intentions and desires respecting staying in the army?—I think not.

3240. Do you think that any sum of money offered to them to enable them to retire after a limited period of service, say 10 or 15 years, would be accepted by many men?—No, I do not think so.

3241. If many come in who do not mean to make it their permanent profession they would be glad, would they not, to take a sum of money on going out?—Yes.

3242. Would not that help matters?—Yes. Perhaps I was wrong in saying that. Of course it might help it, but I think that as to those who have come in, you can tell pretty well those who will stay, and those who have come in to go away after a short time.

3243. Those who have come in without the intention to stay would probably go, you think, without any money inducement?—Yes, they would certainly go without any money, but they would much rather get it if they could.

3244. What do you think of the suggestion of retiring a man compulsorily by the time that he becomes a captain of 25 years' standing?—In my own regiment and in other regiments that I have met, there is not one captain of 25 years.

3245. As a rule they are not of so long service as that?—Certainly not.

3246. You do not think there is any need in the cavalry of any compulsory system of retirement in the captain's rank in order to facilitate promotion?—I am afraid I could hardly answer that question.

3247. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Did you go to Sandhurst after you were gazetted?—No, I passed without.

3248. There are one or two officers in the Staff College from the 14th Hussars; does not a feeling exist rather against the officers who are in the Staff College, in consequence of their being taken away from their regiment?—Certainly there is a very strong feeling indeed, because it throws the duties on others, and of course they go to the Staff College for their own advancement, and not for the good of the regiment in any way.

3249. Are you aware of a subaltern in the cavalry at Aldershot now of 16 years' service?—I know that there is a very old subaltern; I should say he is about 16 years' service.

3250. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) How did you enter the service?—I entered the service by a competitive examination.

3251. Were you at a crammer's?—No.

The witness withdrew.

Lieutenant the Hon. J. C. Amherst.

Lieutenant the Honourable JEFFERY C. AMHERST examined.

3252. (*Chairman.*) You are in the rifle brigade, I believe?—Yes.

3253. How many years' service have you?—Nearly 12 years. I am in Colonel Maclean's battalion.

3254. You have heard Colonel Maclean state to the Commission his views about promotion and retirement, do you agree with him?—Yes, I agree with him generally.

Lieutenant the Hon. J. C. Amherst.

11 May 1875.

3255. What do you think about compulsory retirement for a captain after 25 years' service; do you think that it would be a thing that the army would willingly accept?—Yes, I think so.

3256. It is in truth for the benefit of the whole army in producing promotion?—Yes, I think it must be acceptable. I do not know that it would be willingly accepted by captains of 25 years' service.

3257. Individuals might not desire any such change, but would the change be looked upon by the army as a whole as one that would be favourably received?—Yes.

3258. And a voluntary retirement perhaps at 20 years you think would be accepted?—Yes, I think so.

3259. Do you agree that it would be desirable to offer to any subaltern or captain of less standing than 20 years some sum of money as an inducement to retire, so as to empty the ranks and give promotion?—I think it would be unnecessary below 20 years.

3260. Do you think there would always be a sufficient number retiring without a sum of money to keep up that flow of promotion which we all understand to be so desirable?—No, I cannot quite say that; but I do not see how any inducement could be sufficiently large to induce a man to retire voluntarily.

3261. Not if he wished to remain on in the army as his profession, but supposing for private reasons he wished to go?—Then he would leave under any circumstances.

3262. Might there not be many men whose position might be this, that they had private reasons for being very willing to leave the service, but their pecuniary circumstances would not admit of their doing it, and then the addition of a sum of money might enable them to satisfy their own wishes?—Yes.

3263. Is not that a thing which might occur?—Yes.

3264. You have not perhaps very much considered how that might be worked out?—I have hardly considered it at all.

3265. What do you say about brevet; are you one of those who think that it is an undesirable system?—I think it is undesirable, and that it would be better to substitute a decoration and a reward, except in very exceptional cases.

3266. You think that that would be preferable to officers?—Yes.

3267. Have you ever heard that matter discussed by officers?—No, never; that is merely my own opinion. I know that there is a feeling against brevet rank being sometimes too easily obtained.

3268. Have you heard that pretty generally expressed?—Yes, I have.

3269. And with regard to bringing in officers from out of other regiments, and thereby disturbing the pure regimental seniority, is that a popular thing or not in the army?—Unpopular, I should say.

3270. Have you heard it much discussed or complained of?—It would be unpopular in my own regiment I know.

3271. And do you think that when an officer is passed over he ought to retire at once, or would you give him another chance?—He ought to retire at once.

3272. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) How did you enter the army?—By purchase.

3273. You entered by competition, I think you said?—It was not by competition, it was an open examination. I got a sufficient number of marks.

3274. The system of competitive examination had not come in when you entered the service?—No.

3275. Have you heard the question of competition for entry into the army discussed much at mess and in military circles?—No, I do not think I have.

3276. You have not heard the crammers spoken of with some degree of feeling;—No, not at all; a crammer is a most useful thing, because without his help, many men calculated to make good officers would be unable to get into the army.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday next at 12 o'clock.

War Office, Pall Mall, Thursday, 13th May 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

General the Right Hon. LORD STRATHNAIRN, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., examined.

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

3277. (*Chairman.*) One of the first and most important questions that the Commission have discussed, is whether promotion in the army ought, so far as it does go by seniority, to go by seniority in the regiment, or whether it would be better to take a large area and let the seniority go by the arm of the service or by the army at large; what is your lordship's opinion about it?—I think like most rules it has its exceptions. As a rule I would let it go in the regiment, on the principle that it promotes very much the *esprit de corps* and good-will in the regiment, by keeping together the same officers, and that it gives them also all the fair chances of deaths in bad climates and casualties in the field; but in the very exceptional case of a very deserving officer who had been at a complete standstill, I would make an exception in his favour and give him promotion.

3278. That is to say, in exceptional cases you would bring in a stranger from another regiment, if had had a very long period of service without promotion?—Yes; in the case of a meritorious officer having had a very long period of disappointment and not having enjoyed the usual good fortune, but rather an extraordinary run of bad luck.

3279. That I believe is the system which is pretty much adhered to at present, is it not?—I presume that your lordship does not include now in this question the consideration of merit, but simply of seniority.

3280. The question that I am putting to you at present regards this point, whether the seniority to be regarded should be seniority in the regiment, or seniority in the army or in the branch of the service to which the officer belongs?—I believe, speaking generally, in seniority in the regiment.

3281. To whatever extent you act upon seniority it should be seniority in the regiment?—Yes, certainly, but with exceptions occasionally. No officer objects

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

to a very old and good officer being passed over him.

3282. Would you say that it was advisable under any circumstances to promote in the regiment one officer over the heads of others in that regiment on account of merit?—Not in the regiment except in cases of remarkable merit, where an officer might have saved his regiment or the colours, or anything of that sort, some remarkable case of devotion; then I would give it to him over the heads of others.

3283. With regard to promotion by merit, is there any system that has occurred to you under which merit, in time of peace, could be ascertained so as to make it the basis of any system of promotion?—Speaking in the sense of the evidence which I gave before to a Royal Commission on this very point, I should say that there is a very safe basis, which is the opinion of the commanding officer of the regiment, confirmed by that of the commanding officer at his half-yearly inspections of the regiment, of the capabilities of an officer, the general officer having called the officer out to test him in his knowledge of the moving of a regiment with a strategical object—not merely mechanical movements, but movements with an object. For instance he would say, as I always said to an officer, "If our right flank is attacked, what movement would you perform?" "You have to retire; how would you retire before an enemy?" &c. And then I should add to this the examination in the field. Then afterwards when the inspecting general goes to the officers' mess-room, or round the barracks, he would examine the officers commanding the company and the subalterns as to the state of discipline of his company, asking him who were the worst men and who were the best men; what was the average of crime in the month or the year; the price of all necessaries, and so forth; and what he would do if he had to confine a very drunken man (which is an essential point of the Queen's Regulations); that he should not hazard discipline by letting an officer of authority or a non-commissioned officer appear on the occasion, but entrust the confinement of a man to his comrades, treating him as a man without sense; that is the sort of thing, because if a man strikes a non-commissioned officer in a state of utter loss of capacity through drink, he is obliged to be subjected to a court-martial.

3284. You say that the commanding officer and the inspecting general have the means together of forming a true opinion of an officer's merit in the way you have described?—Yes.

3285. Would it be your opinion that they should report that opinion to the commander-in-chief?—That is reported anyhow. The commanding officer sees how the officer has been disciplined and instructed, and if any officer is not it should be stated in the confidential report.

3286. Those matters which you have been stating ought to be included in the confidential report?—Yes, as forming the opinion of the commanding officer upon an officer generally. If any officer is deficient he should say so-and-so is a little slack, or of another officer, he has committed such and such a fault, but he has amended it—or anything he likes to say as a proof of the correctness of his opinion; and I never remember yet where there has been a good commanding officer, when I have approved of an officer's movement of a regiment, or the answers he gave as to discipline, that that good opinion was not always confirmed by the commanding officer.

3287. In the course of your experience in the positions which you have held have you had much experience of those confidential reports?—Yes, great experience.

3288. Do you think that they are efficient?—I think they are admirable in their theory, with the exception that they should not be called confidential, that gives them a bad prestige.

3289. You agree, do you not, that an officer who is reported against should be told of it at the time?—Yes, certainly.

3290. And you would not call them confidential?—No; that is to say I would draw the line. The generality of the report, such as in the case of a captain whether he moved his regiment well, all that should be entirely out of the limit of confidential reports. I should not be sorry that every report that I made should be published; there are no secrets in them, and this word "confidential" hurts the character and prestige of those reports. As I say, there is no rule without an exception; there are painful cases, one can easily imagine that, in a regiment in which women are mixed, or crime of a particular sort which it would be against the good repute of the army and everything else to be published, but only with that reserve I should like the reports to be perfectly free, and not called confidential reports. Many do not like the word, they do not like putting down a censure under the term confidential, and they feel that they should not care a bit if the officer knew it or not; indeed, it would be better that he should know it.

3291. Assuming these reports to be made as you say, and to give a fair description of the merits or demerits of the officers, how would you act upon them; would you act upon them only by way of refusing promotion to an unfit man, or would you make them a reason for giving promotion to a man who appeared specially fit?—I would give an unfit man a certain time to look round and show whether he was really a good man or the contrary.

3292. You would give him another chance?—Yes, I would give him another chance, particularly if he displayed any spirit of enterprise, if his error was chiefly to be attributed to youth, or too great ardour, or that sort of thing; but if he was an inveterately dull officer, or in other respects very objectionable, I would then remove him from the service.

3293. That is so much for rejection or passing a man over; what do you say as to making those reports the basis of selection to put a man forward specially?—In the first place I do not know whether that rule has been altered. I believe it has been altered, but I know I strongly urged that a promising regimental officer should, when backed up by those reports, have full right to be on the staff, on any description of staff. There is no regiment that has not its six or seven or eight promising officers, and I think that they should be rewarded with staff appointments, and occasional promotions, where it was not advisable to promote in the regiment You can pick out at once such officers. Where an officer had been proved inefficient, as shown by the confidential reports, you would not promote him, you would promote another officer from another regiment.

3294. That is to say, when there was a vacancy in another regiment with no very fit man to fill it, you would then take the opportunity to put in the place of that man one of those selected men?—Yes, one of those selected officers. In India I had a great sphere for that, because the Government were good enough to entrust to me (and I did not think they objected to what I did) the whole promotion in the army. I issued a general order, saying that I would give it for merit, and it had a wonderful effect.

3295. Did you find any difficulty in acting upon it?—Never the slightest.

3296. Have you any reason from what occurred afterwards in the experience which showed itself to doubt whether you had selected capable men?—In one or two cases I selected an officer for particular merit, for gallantry in action and decision, and I gave him a higher rank. He had had all the courage and adventure and devotion for the grade in which he had been before, but he had not a head perhaps for responsibilities of the higher rank, and then I told him frankly, "I have done all I can for you, and now I must stop."

3297. As a general rule you found that your selections had answered well?—Perfectly. So far from its being thought invidious, although I think I passed over some 10 to 15 officers for brigade appointments and division appointments, there cer-

tainly never appeared in parliament any complaint as to my selections, and when I went away from India the Indian press without any exception whatever upheld what I had done.

3298. Did you apply that rule of selection by merit to all ranks?—Yes, to all ranks.

3299. But perhaps at the time you are speaking of, owing to the operations that were going on, you had considerable means of knowing the merits of the officers, would those same means exist in time of peace?—I had only command of the division or field force, as they call it, as major general in the campaign, and then when I succeeded to the command it was peace, except the little frontier wars, where you have very great opportunity of finding out the merits of your officers. It is the great advantage of the Indian service, that as Lord Dalhouise said in his foresight, which was great, that the elements of war are so rife that you do not know when it may happen in those districts, and therefore you have constantly those little wars which draw forth the energies, the capacities, the presence of mind, and the judgment of an officer.

3300. Those little wars therefore give the authorities an opportunity of discovering merit?—Great opportunity.

3301. Would you have the same sort of means, or anything like the same means, with respect to the peace establishment of this country?—Ireland furnishes a little field sometimes. There are the elections, where as I said in one report of Captain Drought who commanded the 15th regiment at Dundalk, "This officer as well as others in that position has had occasion to show more presence of mind and judgment than very often falls to a general officer commanding a brigade in campaign. He had thousands of infuriated people attacking him. In this particular case the Fenians were acting under American tactic, which they learnt in the great war; they had blocked up the bridge, and there was a cross fire, what they call smashers, from both sides of the river; they rushed at the cavalry. Unfortunately the disposition of the troops happened to be in the hands of the stipendiary magistrate, and against my positive order he put the cavalry, the 14th hussars, in front. The mob rushed at them and knocked the horses on their noses, and they fell back upon the infantry, producing the utmost confusion, and if it had not been for this one man the consequence would have been very serious indeed.

3302. You said that when you issued this general order with reference to promotion by merit in India, it produced great effect, to what were you particularly alluding to then?—It had a great effect in producing remarkable zeal in the army. Very often after I had inspected a native regiment, I told the commanding officer to tell so-and-so in his brigade that when there is an adjutancy or a regimental vacancy I should give it him.

3303. Do you think that promotion by selection on account of merit a feasible thing?—Perfectly. I will explain the machinery of it as I gave it out in the order. When an officer applied for promotion, or indeed it was not necessary always to apply, for I had an opportunity of knowing, through inspecting the regiment, he sent in his statements of service; that statement of service ought to be improved, and ought to enter more fully into detail (in fact it should be like the good character of a servant), and to mention everything noble that he had done; that he had been mentioned in the dispatches; that he had volunteered to attack a fort; that he was the first over the parapet; that he was very much pressed in retreat, and that he had halted and made a dashing movement; in fact, it should enter into every detail. The military secretary used to bring up his report, and it was settled in a day. As I have said, I have two or three times promoted men to a higher position than their head fitted them for; not that their character or courage did not entitle them to it, but beyond that they could not go, and I said, "If you improve or "gain more experience or better experience I shall "be very happy not to shut the door to you, but now "you must stand still where you are."

3304. What effect did a system of that sort produce upon the officers with regard to their own satisfaction; were they satisfied with it?—Public opinion in the army went quite with that system. It is perfectly well known in the army who are efficient officers, just as well as it is in the regiment.

3305. You think it is perfectly well known in a regiment who are the really efficient men?—Always. When you dine at mess, and you say, There is a very young man, who is he? they will say, He is a very promising officer.

3306. I presume you have been speaking throughout in your latter remarks about the Indian army, not the royal army?—Not quite, because I have been giving an illustration of hill stations, and I gave you the case of officers of the royal army who have particularly attracted my attention for their efficiency, and I gave them that which was in my power to give. I gave one in the 43rd a command at Currachee, and several others the same way.

3307. The general system to which you have been alluding, under which promotion was given by merit irrespective of previous rank, was one that applied to the Indian army?—Yes, to the Indian army, with this exception, that where I could I gave it to officers of the royal army. I gave the command of a convalescent station, or a command at Currachee, or station commands of brigade major, and so on.

3308. Promotion in the Indian army, I believe, goes according to the number of years' service, and is independent of vacancies above?—That is in the staff corps. The system in the Indian army is this. After the mutiny the idea was very prevalent that the system of irregular regiments was better adapted for that work than the regular regiments. This applied chiefly to the cavalry, and the consequence was that after a certain lapse of time the whole army was put upon an irregular footing; that is to say, that in place of the normal ranks of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, major, captain, lieutenant, and so forth, I created a new system of colonel, lieutenant-colonels, commandant, second in command, wing officers, and so forth, only very much diminishing the number of officers, and that is now in force. Unluckily they shut their eyes to a great cause of the inefficiency of the native army, which was the very cause of the superior efficiency of the irregular part of it, because the Government of India took all the leading and best officers of the regular regiment, with its hierarchy of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, major, captain, and subaltern, and put them into the irregular service, so that as I said it in my report to Lord Canning, there was inefficiency at the top and raw ignorance at the bottom.

3309. What is your opinion of the importance of obtaining men at a somewhat earlier period of life as field officers?—I certainly attach great importance to it if a man is equal to it.

3310. If he is in other respects fit, do you consider that an earlier period of life is an important element or not?—Very much so.

3311. What age would you say, if you had to fix upon the best age which you would prefer, for a man to have command of a regiment?—It is very difficult to do that, because it is entirely relative. It all depends upon the capacity, and therefore I do not think that you can very well assign an age, for the time when an officer should have a command is the time when he should be most fit, because there are exceptions; some men show great capacity earlier than others.

3312. It is obvious that it must be open to many exceptions; but on the average, if you were trying to get the best field officer, what age would you like to have him as a rule?—I should say it is difficult to lay down a fixed rule. The great thing is the art of discipline, and that is only learnt by experience. What you want is a capital officer for moving a regiment, and he should be as good as can be; but that

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

knowledge can only be attained by great experience of men's characters.

3313. On the one hand you have the necessity of getting a man of a sufficient number of years to give him experience, and on the other hand you want him at a sufficient early age to give you a man of full physical vigour?—Certainly. I should say that an officer cannot be quite fit to command a regiment at 25, but I should say that seven or eight years' service ought to qualify an officer for the command of a regiment if he is an able and talented officer.

3314. You would hardly expect to get that state of things in any system of promotion in time of peace?—Certainly not, but I would not let it be a bar in war to giving an officer of that description a regiment.

3315. But in time of peace you think that a field officer should attain the rank after, say, 20 years' service?—I should not go beyond that, because an officer of much capacity gets tired of the routine of the barrack yard and the regiment, and becomes slack about it.

3316. Therefore you would say that 20 years' service was quite long enough?—Yes, quite long enough.

3317. You said a word about the staff just now. At the present time we are told that the junior appointments on the staff are given to men who have passed through the Staff College; do you think that that is a desirable rule to be adhered to?—No, I do not.

3318. You would take a wider range?—Certainly. I would not say that it breeds a spirit of discontent, but there are young men of promise in every regiment in the service. You have excellent adjutants, and there is nothing so good a qualification for a commanding officer as a good adjutant. They learn, as I say, the difficult art of discipline. The discipline generally is in a great measure in their hands, and they learn it by constant management of the men. One of the best arts of discipline is justice, and steady good temper with the men, and decision.

3319. Therefore you say that service with the regiment is calculated to bring out the qualities which make a good staff officer better than the going through the Staff College?—Certainly; an officer cannot learn discipline in the Staff College, of which, after all, the great secret is management. If a regiment gets undisciplined on service it becomes useless.

3320. I presume you think that the intellectual acquirement which is obtained at the Staff College is a useful thing?—Very useful, but it is practical knowledge that is wanted. I would not clip their wings. I would let them soar as high as they can; but in the case of the average race of men, generally speaking, I think that the practical knowledge required for the army is so extensive now and so important that I would not sacrifice it to any accessory general acquirement. Some of the books that they have to get up are very good for literary men, but they occupy a long time, and the physical health of officers suffers from too much confinement.

3321. You would direct the studies of staff officers at the Staff College very much to practical subjects?—Yes; there are all Moreau's campaigns and the great wars on the continent to study, which must open their minds, and the history of the British army is most valuable knowledge, but the general class of men must be sacrificed if you give them too much accessory knowledge.

3322. Again, on the question of the staff, is it desirable, do you think, that after an officer has held a staff appointment for five years he should be reappointed to the staff, or do you think it more desirable that appointments to the staff should be spread over the army, and that a man should go back to his regiment, and some other man should be taken for the staff?—There again I would not have a general fixed rule. With an officer of general capacity it would be very good for the exercise of his capacity and his ability that he should develop them in different directions; for instance, that an adjutant-general should be acquainted with the mode of discipline, and with the quartermaster-general's department, and with strategy. Therefore it should be in the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief, if there is an officer who has displayed those gallant qualities, the art of moving troops, and strategy, who had hitherto been only in a department relating to discipline, he should have given him the advantage of further experience in the other branches.

3323. But subject to that?—Subject to that I think it is the right thing that they should go back to their regiments.

3324. Will you let me ask you what you think of the system of brevet; there has been a very general opinion expressed to the Commission that brevet for distinguished service is a thing which has been too lavishly bestowed of late, do you concur in that opinion?—I think it has.

3325. What is your opinion of the brevet system, speaking generally, is it a desirable sytem to continue?—I think it is if it is given with discretion to reward distinguished merit. It lifts an officer into a higher sphere of action.

3326. Might not that be done in other ways, might it not be done by unattached promotion, or by direct substantive promotion to a regiment in a higher rank than that which he previously occupied?—But it is so difficult to find this promotion. Then brevet rank carries him on in his profession in the army, and he becomes a general officer quicker and comes to a higher command. He may be appointed to the staff, and then when he gets to a certain age he becomes a brigadier or a major general quicker.

3327. No other scheme occurs to you by which a meritorious officer could be brought forward to a higher command than by brevet?—In the way that I say, giving him occasionally, but with the utmost verification of his merits, substantive promotion in a regiment.

3328. But the vacancies would not be sufficiently frequent, would they?—I think they would be sufficiently frequent if inefficient officers were compelled to retire. Therefore I do not think it is of any use in the confidential reports mentioning merit prominently if you do not also mention demerit. I think if that was done *pari passu* you would have quite a sufficient number of appointments.

3329. Possibly then in that way we might get rid of brevet, which presents many anomalies; it is an anomalous thing, is it not, that a man should be doing captain's duty in a regiment when he is a colonel in the army?—I would not continue it; I think he should leave his regiment. Beyond a certain point I do not consider it a good principle. He might go on for a certain time, but as you say it is an anomaly that another officer should have to do his duty at the trenches, upon a review, and so forth.

3330. It has been suggested that, with a view of rewarding men who have done their duty well in active operations, something in the nature of a decoration with a good service pension attached to it would be a desirable thing. What do you think of that?—I think it would be very desirable, especially for officers without means; certainly it would be a great help to them in their regiments.

3331. Do you think it would be acceptable to the army from what you know of the general feeling amongst military men?—They have now the Victoria cross, and that carries a pension for the men but not for the officers. There would be a difficulty if an officer was very well off; to give him a small pension would be valueless to him comparatively.

3332. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) The Legion of Honour carries a pension with it, does it not, in the different grades?—Yes, but I think that perhaps mixing the honour with the money would hardly be well. I think you might find other ways. It would be difficult to carry out, I think, except with non-commissioned officers and men.

3333. (*Chairman.*) With regard to the fixed establishment of general officers, have you had your

mind drawn to the question whether it is desirable that the list of general officers should be dealt with in any different way to what it is now dealt with. I mean that it should be divided into two lists, an active and a retired list, or anything of that kind ?—That might be done, certainly. Then an officer on the retired list would be like what they call the yellow admiral in the navy. I do not think, though, that it succeeded in the navy. It has created great dissatisfaction, and certainly I know some excellent officers that are no longer employed in consequence of it. I do not think that under the present system due attention is paid to the claim of officers before they come to this rank, because, as I had the honour to say before the Royal Commission before, it is due to the unfortunate man who is an inefficient officer to remove him and give him the means of entering some other mode of life, in which he may gain his bread. I would not on any account restrict it as I believe it is now to the rank of a field officer, to ascertain the merit of an officer. Any good commanding officer and any good general officer could ascertain that point before a man became a captain.

3334. Then you would, as I understand you, adopt some system by which men who were the least deserving and least fitted for military life would be either induced or compelled to leave the army before they arrive at the higher ranks ?—Before they arrive at an age at which they cannot go into any fresh employment or mode of livelihood.

3335. The difficulty of any such system of voluntary retirement with a sum of money is that, unless you make it a system of compulsory retirement based upon the demerits of the officer, some of the good men would go as well as the inefficient ones ?—Yes, I did not mean to give them any money.

3336. How would you get them out otherwise ?—I would simply say to a man that his commanding officer had reported very unfavourably of him, and that so many general officers had confirmed that opinion.

3337. That is in a case of positive inefficiency ?—Yes.

3338. That would hardly be so frequently the case as largely to empty the ranks, would it ; you would hardly decrease in any sensible degree the number of men coming forward to the general officers' list by merely rejecting those who were absolutely inefficient ?—It is rather difficult to say to what extent you would go in that direction.

3339. So far as you would go in your mind now, you would remove scrupulously those who were positively inefficient ?—Yes, they are perfectly well known in a regiment.

3340. Under the present system general officers become general officers rather too late in life, do they not ?—Yes, they do. I certainly think that I should on the same principle, if I promoted an officer from a regiment and found that the superior responsibility of his rank was not accompanied by sufficient head, or prudence, or judgment, I should stop him there. Although, as I say, it would be advisable to get rid of officers who had given a great proof of want of intellect in the lower ranks, yet that may appear more plainly when they rise to higher grades.

3341. You mean that there may be certain men who are fit to be good subalterns or good captains, but not fit to be commanders of regiments ?—Yes.

3342. Would you remove such men ?—I think that in those cases certainly half pay, if it was not abused, would be the proper thing.

3343. That is to say, in the form of a pension ?—Yes, in the form of a pension, that would be better than half pay.

3344. What should you say of some system of this kind in order to create and maintain a sufficient flow of promotion in the army, that a man if he had not become a major after 20 years' service should then be retired on a pension commensurate with his full pay ?—Yes, I advised that in India ; when I passed over officers I said that there were many excellent men whose capacities did not fit them for employment in their present rank ; but who had done good service, and I strongly advised the Government to give them a pension. The Government of India followed that suggestion, and with very good results.

3345. That would prevent a block ?—Yes, it would prevent a block, and satisfy them too.

3346. Under the existing rule a lieutenant-colonel can only hold the command of a regiment for five years ; do you approve of that ?—I do not approve of it at all.

3347. Do you think that he ought to remain on as long as he liked ?—I think that that man should do as he did before. If he is happy in the regiment and has got it into a very good state, it would be throwing away the chance of the continuance of an excellent state of things to do that, and as a reward I certainly would let him remain there. I would not change him after five years. An officer of that sort is invaluable. He brings up a number of good young officers, and he introduces an excellent tone into the regiment. A good commanding officer makes his regiment move in every position that you can imagine, and gives a gentlemanlike tone to the officers, and I think that it would be a great pity to remove such an officer.

3348. The weight of his authority naturally increases with time ?—Yes, the weight of his authority naturally increases with time, and it is an excellent school for other officers. If you take him away and put him on half pay he becomes disappointed, and the regiment loses all that efficiency which it possessed, and which has made it such a good school for young officers.

3349. Under the purchase system, when there was no such restriction as that, you are aware that the average length of time that a man held command of a regiment was only $6\frac{1}{2}$ years, but you know that they were anxious to get their over-regulation money, and they went on half pay to get it ?—Exactly.

3350. If a man was efficient and had shown himself a good commanding officer, you would allow him to remain there for any length of time ?—Yes, certainly. With men like Colonel Oakes and Colonel Baker, it is a sort of hothouse for the service ; it brings forward merit in a way that no other system would do.

3351. You would seek means of promotion in some other way ?—Certainly.

3352. Do you think that the promotion gained by this five-years' rule would be gained at a great expense of military efficiency ?—Yes, at a great expense of military efficiency, and of the example of training young officers. A perfect commanding officer is a great desideratum.

3353. I suppose you would say that it is not desirable in a military point of view, or for the good of the service generally, that an officer who has had command of his regiment and become full colonel and gone on half pay, should remain on half pay very long before he becomes major-general ?—No, I do not think that is desirable.

3354. You think it is desirable that as soon as possible he should be going forward ?—Yes, going forward and becoming acquainted with all the new weapons. He should not turn his thoughts to anything else.

3355. In order to effect that object would it be, do you think, desirable to offer a man in the position of lieutenant-colonel having held command of a regiment a liberal pension, if he liked to retire, so as to clear the list ?—Yes, if he was inefficient. For instance, a man may have become a lieutenant-colonel, and then he has to take the field against a certain tribe, and he does not do so well as he ought to do. He has gone on very well up to that rank, but on this particular occasion for the display of his efficiency and his presence of mind under difficulties he has been found wanting, and it would be a pity to put that man into a sphere of such active service where his want of ability and nerve might cause a great misfortune to an army.

3356. You think that any such retirements as I

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

have alluded to ought not to be retirements based upon a general system open to anybody to hold them, but that they ought to be addressed to the particular individual?—To the particular individual; a statement should be made out of the officers of merit, and that would preclude it being made too general.

3357. Would not it be somewhat of a disgrace to a man to retire under such circumstances?—He must have done good service before in order to be qualified.

3358. I am talking of voluntary retirement, and seeing that it would be somewhat of a disgrace, would men take it?—Every day officers go out; they succeed to fortunes, or they do not feel very well in health, and for a variety of reasons they go out.

3359. You think that a retirement might be offered to him, and he might take it without anything being said which would disparage him?—Yes, there would be no harm in saying in a particular case that he might have got into a very unlucky affair with his officers for want of good sense and tact. I think there are many occasions when there would be no objection to tell him what it was, that you recognised his former good services, and were sorry that he should be destitute of those qualities. I have always found a frank explanation, of course courteously done, have a good effect. Many officers used to come to me and say, Why are we passed over? and I was always most courteous to them, but I said that they were not quite up to the standard, but if I could do anything else for them I would, and I have recommended officers for the public works, and so on.

3360. Do you think that some benefit might be got for the purpose of creating promotion by throwing open to officers some appointments out of the army; such for instance as the control department, or the commissariat department?—Yes; many of those officers have a great talent for figures and accounts, and they would be extremely useful. Others have a mechanical turn that fits them for the Board of Works, for which in India there is a great field with the inundations and the works that are thrown up on the roads, and so forth. Some of those officers that are not useful or quite up to command might be very useful in other ways.

3361. You think that it would be desirable to throw those appointments open to them?—Yes, certainly, and it would make the retirement less painful to them and less difficult to carry out.

3362. We have been told that under the purchase system it was impossible to get rid of an officer who was absolutely incompetent, even if he was a madman or an idiot; is that in accordance with your experience?—I never experienced any such difficulty at all. In such a case I should say that he was utterly inefficient, and I should strongly recommend that the Queen should use her prerogative of relieving him of his position, by giving him his money back of course.

3363. That was done, was it not, under the purchase system?—Yes, without the least difficulty.

3364. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) It would be the duty, would it not, of the commanding officer of the regiment to bring such a thing to the notice of the authorities?—Yes, in the common course of things.

3365. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) If an officer neglected his duty, of course the duty of the commanding officer would be to put him under arrest, and bring him to a court martial for neglect of duty?—That depends upon what the neglect of duty was. It would be an extreme measure for an extreme offence.

3366. Supposing that the duty was done in such a slovenly manner as to bring discredit upon the service, the commanding officer had power to suspend that officer from the performance of all duties, and report him to the superior authorities?—Exactly, but he should not have ascertained that all at once. He should have ascertained in due time that this officer would come to this critical state of inefficiency, and then such an officer, who would be removed, so as to prevent this dilemma occurring. By timely observation of his demerits, you might avoid his bringing the regiment into discredit, or doing any great harm.

3367. (*Lord Hampton*). With regard to what your lordship has just said about the five years' rule, if I understand you rightly, you object to the five years' rule, as tending to deprive regiments of valuable colonels?—Yes.

3368. Do I understand therefore that you would have no five years' rule, or that you would approve of the five years' rule, provided it was carried out with full discretion on the part of the Commander-in-Chief?—If a man was a thoroughly efficient officer I would let him stay on, if he was not I would remove him at the end of that time. If the former experience of this officer had not enabled the Commander-in-Chief or the general officer in command to judge of that, then I would follow that system. If after his 15 or 20 years' of service, or whatever it was, they had not been able to judge as to whether he would make a good commanding officer, and if he then showed proofs that he was not so, then I would remove him at the end of the five years; but still I would give ample power to retain him if he was efficient.

3369. You are of course aware of the existing warrant, which requires that a commanding officer shall be removed at the end of five years, but reserving the power of the military authorities to reappoint. My question to you is, whether you would disapprove of that warrant altogether, and get rid of the five years' limit, or whether you would approve of retaining the five years' limit, provided that practically the authorities exercised their power of reappointment of such men according to their merits?—Of course if a man displayed during those five years any want of efficiency, I would remove him then, but I would also have done it sooner.

3370. You do not quite answer my question, which is, whether you would retain the five years' rule?—Yes, I would.

3371. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that the rule is one which in itself should be retained?—I think that if you remove him at the end of five years it is as great a mark of disapproval of an officer as if you had removed him sooner, so that the five years are not necessary in order to come to an appreciation of his demerits; and during the whole of that time, if he ought to be removed at the end of five years, I think it is very odd that he did not give proofs which would justify his removal sooner.

3372. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do I understand from you that looking to the welfare of the army you would prefer, if you had the choice, to adopt the five years' rule, with open discretion of the Commander-in-Chief as to reappointment, or would you prefer to retain the previous system, under which officers in all cases retained their command without any specific limit up to 60 years of age?—That rather brings to bear my previous evidence. I think that if an officer were inefficient, I would remove him on the same principle that I would remove every inefficient officer. I would not let an officer remain who had been very inefficient during that five years, and had got his regiment into a bad state and set up a disagreeable state of relations between him and the officers, perhaps through his own fault and want of tact. If that were ascertained in the course of one year or two years, my principle would be that I would remove him then, and therefore I do not think it is necessary to have this five years' probation.

3373. Then I think I understand your general answer to be that without regard to any particular period of five years, if an officer were good you would keep him, and if he were not good you would send him away?—Yes.

3374. Under those circumstances, in the case of a very good officer whom you have well described as getting his regiment into very good order, would you keep that officer without any limit as to time beyond that of 60 years of age?—I think so. He should pass from that to be a general officer. I think it acts very well.

3375. Looking at the system which has been springing up in the army since purchase has been

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

abolished, would you not be afraid that retaining officers in command of regiments so long might have the effect of very much retarding the promotion in the lower ranks?—I would keep a sound principle in force under any circumstances. I would keep a good officer; I would not sacrifice a good officer for that. Then we come to the great question of retirement.

3376. When you spoke of what you called the confidential reports, I understood you to be speaking of the English army and not of the Indian army; is that so?—I was speaking of the English army at the time, but my remarks would apply to the Indian army too.

3377. You spoke of the good effect produced by that general order about promoting by merit; supposing that rule to be adopted in England, and your advice were acted upon, that they should no longer be considered or marked as confidential reports, do you think that a similar effect would be produced in this country, and that the knowledge that such a report was hanging over them would increase the zeal of the officers of the British army and make those reports more effective?—I think it would. It would give the order and those who issued it more influence by far, and they would respect the order. Everybody now does not like this word "confidential."

3378. "Report" without "confidential" would be more effective?—More effective, certainly.

3379. Do not you think that leaving out the word "confidential" might have any bad effect in this way, that it might have a deterring effect upon the commanding officer with regard to speaking openly as to the real merits of his officers?—I do not think so. I think where it has had a bad effect in the confidential reports was this, that the commanding officer (and I know that was the case) of regiments and general officers have one inspection after another through a long course of years reported very favourably and the officers see that it has not been followed by any good result, either as regards their reports or the officers themselves, and they therefore very much lost their influence with them, because not one of those commanding officers and general officers also saw that his reports were attended to. I think they would be much more particular and scrupulous than they are now.

3380. I should like to ask your opinion upon a point upon which we have had a good deal of evidence which relates to the organisation of the army, and to learn whether your experience leads you to approve of the system which I believe is almost universal in the continental armies of having larger units than we have at present, viz.: the squadron as the unit of cavalry, and the double company as the unit of infantry regiments?—I think that it succeeds very well with the foreign armies where their companies are more than double the strength of ours. The Russian companies in the Crimea were 250, but it was ascertained after long experience and ample discussion that with our small squadrons of troops the system of drill did not succeed, and in Ireland particularly where you sometimes have only barracks for troops, and so forth, that was a very prominent cause of its failure, and the Commander-in-Chief ended by doing away with the system of squadron drill.

3381. Do you consider the practice which we have in England and Ireland of scattering our cavalry regiments a good deal about, to be the only objection to adopting the squadron as the unit?—On the one hand it tends rather to disorganise the men, yet on the other it gives habits of command and responsibility to the junior officers, and the state of the country requires it.

3382. Assuming that the state of the country requires that our regiments should be scattered in small bodies and supposing the squadron of cavalry to be our unit, would there be any more difficulty in detaching a half squadron to any particular quarter than there is now in sending a troop to it?—There is this question of the drill. We found that the position of a captain who commanded a half squadron did not produce good results. It produced rather a jar between them, and the ranks were not sufficiently defined between him and the squadron officers.

3383. Supposing that together with adopting the larger unit the senior officer in each squadron or company were to be a major with a captain under him, would that meet the difficulty, do you think, or would you approve of that change?—It would meet the difficulty of there not being any similitude of rank between the two, and it would certainly have a very good effect. The only objection would be whether you would approve of that great increase of majors. You have two majors in a regiment as it is, and then with those very small cavalry regiments with eight troops you would have four more majors, so that there would be six majors. With our present small establishment it is a question whether the finance would allow it, otherwise I think it would be a good plan.

3384. A plan has been submitted to this Commission by which an arrangement of that kind could be carried out without increased expense; if so, is it your opinion, looking only to the military aspect of the question, that that would be a desirable change?—I think it would.

3385. (*Chairman.*) As regards the expense, if the expense was only to be kept down by dispensing with at least two subaltern officers, what would you say to that?—I think that dispensing with any of the present number of officers would be objectionable.

3386. You think that there are not too many?—I think there are not at all too many, considering all the casualties in the field, especially in India. I once had a division of two guns under a non-commissioned officer in action, and I had a regiment under a lieutenant. The regiments were struck down by the cholera, and the superior ranks disappeared in a very remarkable way; so that I would not do away with any number of officers to gain that other advantage.

3387. (*Lord Hampton.*) I think I may say that your own early experience in the army was with the infantry and not with the cavalry?—Yes, with the infantry. I learned the cavalry drill at Bury.

3388. What is your opinion with regard to such a change of organisation as has now been mentioned to you with respect to the infantry having double companies instead of single companies? Do you think that there would be any objection to it, either to the general principle of the organisation, or perhaps more especially with reference to action in the field?—The present Prussian system of large companies is necessary for their extended order in which they fight; but then it is a great question how that would suit our service, and whether this very great extension of order is very desirable. There is great division even amongst Prussian officers themselves upon that point, as the men get such excessive extension that they get out of their power of command either by bugle or by word of command, and if you wish to form and change front it is impossible, and you get into confusion. I have seen myself the Prussians in the greatest state of confusion. As to the Prussian tactics, they will always enjoy very great military advantages; I found that their manœuvres, and their strategy was of a very rapid and forward nature always. In the Austrian campaign the Austrians had to contend with Loraine's rifle, which is like our Minie rifle, which only killed one man to four or five that were killed by the needle gun. In the Austrian army they had two great defects in their lines. They had the Hungarians, but they could not depend upon them, and they do not like to use their cavalry far away from their head-quarters, and they had the Italians who had been removed from the Italian provinces, and they could not trust them. Therefore everything tended to give the Prussian mode of warfare the advantage; but I do not think it would be wise without the greatest reserve to adopt for our service that great extension. Besides, always moving forward, they did not avail themselves much of the ground.

3389. Looking to the effect as to the new arms of precision, might it not be difficult to find one officer to

Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.

13 May 1875.

command the double company in action?—I think so; and from that difficulty the Prussian officers in action are all mounted. I think that our own regimental system is very good. All foreigners approve of it: the French do, and I understand the Emperor of Russia did when he was over here the other day. Our purely regimental system is a universal subject of praise.

3390. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I rather gathered from what you said as regards service on the staff that it should be guided by the selection by regimental commanding officers of promising young men?—Mixed also with the staff. I would not take it away from the staff, but officers of promise in regiments should also enjoy staff appointments.

3391. You think that the selection by the commanding officer for recommendation for staff employment would act as a stimulus to that class of young men in the regiment?—Very much so, and backed also by the reports of the general officer who had inspected the regiment twice every year.

3392. Practically do you think there would be any real difficulty in the way of working that plan for the purpose of getting young men for staff appointments?—I do not think so at all. I think it would infuse life into the staff. There are young men of that sort in every regiment, and I would encourage them to qualify themselves for the staff. It would give a great zest throughout the service if they had this to look to.

3393. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) If I rightly understand you, you are not in favour of a system of voluntary pensioned retirement?—No, I am in favour of it where an officer has been zealous and has only failed through the want of qualifications for his superior command, but has performed perhaps 15 or 20 years' valuable service, I would not turn him upon the world without anything.

3394. You are acquainted with the Indian army very thoroughly, would you see any objection in applying such a system of pensions to the British army as exists in the Indian army?—No, certainly not; I think it would be very desirable. It has produced great contentment, as we all know, in the Indian army.

3395. Do you approve of a system of pensions on full pay in all ranks after a certain period of service?—Yes; I mean pensions according to the length of service without regard to rank.

3396. Is that a system which obtains in the Indian army with which you are acquainted?—Yes, they have in the Indian army a self-created means in their pensions which are most liberal, and it is an excellent system; it has had a most excellent effect amongst the officers.

3397. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Can you remember any specific case in the regiment in which you served in which an officer was obliged to sell by the authorities in consequence of unfavourable reports made against him by the inspecting-general?—I don't know as to the inspecting-general; I cannot name any at this moment, but I quite remember that cases of that sort have occurred where an officer has been obliged to sell.

3398. You cannot remember a case in point?—I cannot now remember a case. It might be ascertained by reference to the Gazette. I could say so far that I am confident they have existed.

3399. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You would not have doubted your ability to get rid of an officer from your own regiment if you thought him unfit for his work?—No, I would say that it has been made extremely difficult, more so latterly than formerly. I have known officers who have been unfavourably reported or remain in command of regiments and also in the service.

3400. Money probably had a great deal to do with it, the man would lose his over-regulation price?—That may have contributed to it, but still there was great disinclination to move an officer by that means. That has existed, certainly.

3401. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Will you explain in what manner any organising of the cavalry by squadrons in quarters interferes with the drill, the unit being the squadron in the field at the present time?—All that was explained, and there was a board which sat at the Horse Guards under the Duke of Cambridge, I think it was, of which board I was a member, and the subject was fully discussed. I read my statement, and the Duke of Cambridge expressed his adhesion to the general ideas and directed that a practical exhibition of opinion should take place at Aldershot. Of course it did take place, and the Duke, after seeing it, at once said that he did not think it practicable.

3402. Do you mean a practical exhibition of drill of cavalry by squadrons in the field?—Yes.

3403. And he did not approve of it?—No.

3404. (*Mr. Welby.*) I understood you to say just now when Lord Hampton was speaking on the subject of increase in the number of majors in a regiment, that you were opposed to any diminution in the number of officers in order compensate financially for those majors?—Yes.

3405. In the evidence that has been given before us one proposal was that in a regiment consisting at present of two majors and ten captains, that number should be replaced by five majors and five captains, thereby reducing the number of captains by two, but leaving the expense almost as it was before, but that witness added that he would like to have added two or three subalterns to the regiment, would the objection which you have stated to the diminution of officers apply to such a re-organisation as that, to substitute five majors and five captains for two majors and ten captains, adding at the same time one or two or three subalterns to the body?—I should like to think over the subject. It is rather complicated.

3406. At all events, that would be a rather different proposal from that which was brought before you just now, and to which you objected, namely, diminishing the number of active officers in the field?—Exactly so.

3407. (*Chairman.*) Would you think it desirable to do away with the flank majors?—No, certainly not. Their function is most important; they give the base of formation in advancing in column, they preserve the dressing of the pivots, and prevent irregular lines which throw away useless fire.

3408. You do not think it a desirable change in a military point of view?—No; if it involves the doing away of any number of officers, I certainly would not sacrifice the two majors onthe flanks to put them in the ranks.

3409. (*Maj. Gen.-Herbert.*) Are you aware that the majors do not give any points in the new drill?—I always did with my regiment. The rule is laid down I think, that they are to assist the commanding officer in all the movements. If he changes the front to the right in lines of prolongation in the brigade, they are most useful in carrying on the line. It so happened that in consequence of those points in the Alma, a regiment presented only one half of its front, so that its fire was completely neutralised. If they do not present a general line, all the fire of the regiment is lost.

The witness withdrew.

War Office, Pall Mall, Monday, 14th June 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. Lord HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, K.C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Major-General Sir THOMAS PEARS, K.C.B., examined.

Maj.-Gen. Sir T. Pears, K.C.B.
14 June 1875.

3410. (*Chairman.*) I believe you hold the position of Military Secretary to the India Office?—I do.

3411. You are aware perhaps that a question has been referred to this Commission in relation to the fixed establishment of general officers as it is connected with the British army and the Indian staff corps?—Yes, I am aware of that.

3412. The Indian staff corps is organised upon a principle under which men obtained their promotion after giving a number of years' service, independent of any vacancies in the ranks above them?—Up to the rank of colonel.

3413. Of course that is a different system from that upon which the English army is organised?—Yes.

3414. Has the result of that difference of system between the two organisations been that the numbers furnished by the staff corps from time to time and those furnished by the army to the fixed establishment of general officers have been very different?—There have been no staff corps officers yet promoted to the fixed establishment of general officers, except those that were transferred from the Indian service, having been already promoted to that rank in that service. No colonels of the staff corps have yet been promoted on what we call the amalgamated list to the rank of major-general.

3415. But within a somewhat limited period the colonels of the staff corps will commence to take their place on the establishment, will they not?—They will within the next three or four years probably.

3416. And when they do so will they do so in some considerable numbers?—Yes; they will do so in very considerable numbers.

3417. Will the numbers of the colonels of the Indian staff corps then coming forward for promotion on to the fixed establishment be larger, do you think, than the reasonable proportion that they ought to bear to the force of the staff corps as contrasted with the British army?—I am afraid they will be very much larger for some years.

3418. Can you give us at all the figures which represent that increase?—No; but the figures, I think, are in the hands of the Commission. They were shown by an actuary's report, which was printed, and which I have, but not here.

3419. Have you seen this paper (*handing it to the witness*), it is Number 53, "On Promotion to the rank of General Officer"?—I do not think this is the paper that I alluded to. It may be included there, but I think it is more distinctly shown in the paper to which I refer. In fact it is a paper drawn up for the express purpose of showing what would be the difference of numbers in the two services for a series of years.

3420. The following is a statement I find in a paper. (Appendix R 1. Actuaries' Report, No. 53), that has been drawn up in the War Office for Mr. Cardwell's information; I should like to know what you think of it: "The result of becoming colonels on different principles is that although the Indian staff corps have in all less than half the number of combatant officers which the British lists have, and have contributed but $\frac{4}{15}$ths of the establishment of general officers, the number of staff corps colonels who after 1878 will come up for promotion to major-general will exceed those of the British list. It is estimated that the numbers will stand as follows: To be promoted in 1879, 4 British colonels and 23 staff corps colonels; in 1880, 12 British colonels and 8 staff corps colonels; in 1881, 8 British colonels and 12 staff corps colonels; in 1882, 8 British colonels and 12 staff corps colonels; in 1883, 10 British colonels and 10 staff corps colonels; in 1884, 7 British colonels and 13 staff corps colonels; in 1885, 6 British colonels and 14 staff corps colonels; in 1886 to 1890, 30 British colonels and 70 staff corps colonels; in 1891 to 1895, 120 British colonels and 180 staff corps colonels." Now, I suppose that that may somewhat accurately represent what will happen?—I have no doubt it does.

3421. This is not a desirable state of things; I presume you would agree in that?—By no means desirable.

3422. Then the question arises, how the evil can best be practically met. Now it has been suggested that the only means, or at least the best means, of meeting it will be to separate the lists and give a definite number of general officers to the British army and a definite number to the staff corps. What do you say to that?—I see no objection to that beyond the probability of renewed agitation and dissatisfaction about the supersession with the two lists. But I should like to take this opportunity of observing that that state of affairs, although it goes on for a great number of years, for at least a generation, is in itself temporary; that it is due, not to the organisation of the staff corps, nor to the system on which they get promotion, but to the fact that we brought a very large number of old Indian officers ripe for promotion under this new system, and put them all into the staff corps; they have tended to collect in the higher grades and to swell them in this abnormal manner.

3423. Would you explain how it is that they have brought this result about?—At the time of the reorganisation of the Indian army we had about 4,500 officers of that service to dispose of. We had to bring them down to the requirements of the service under its new organisation to about 2,500, a level which they have not reached yet even. We allowed all the officers of the old service, who chose, to go into the staff corps and take advantage of these new rules of promotion which were in themselves more favorable than the average rate of promotion in the old Indian army The consequence was that a vast number of men in the old Indian army flocked into the staff corps, being men of the rank of major or of captain, and they were almost immediately entitled to become, under the new rules, lieutenant-colonels.

3424. Because their length of service was such as to qualify them for that step?—Yes. These are the men that have crowded into the upper ranks of the staff corps, and have overloaded them; but if we had begun a new staff corps (and I have always thought it a pity that we had not) on these very same new rules of promotion, we might have found indeed, comparing them to a regimental cadre, that we had a larger proportion of field officers than might have been found in that cadre, but we should have found nothing like this state of things.

3425. And when the system is in full work upon its own merits as a system, that will be the case?—Yes.

3426. But it will take a generation before that will happen?—Yes. Your lordship asked my opinion

Maj.-Gen. Sir T. Pears, K.C.B.

14 June 1875.

as to the formation of two separate lists, and I should say that I know no objection whatever to that, excepting that there would be just the same ground given for agitation and dissatisfaction on the part of either side, the Indian service and the British service, in cases of what is called supersession.

3427. First of all let us regard the question from the aspect of the number of general officers which would bear the legitimate proportion, or a similar proportion, to the combatant officers in each of the two bodies, the Indian staff corps and the British army ; it would not be difficult, I presume, to fix upon a number of general officers attached as it were to each of these two different establishments, which should fairly represent those establishments in regard to their numbers ; that would not be difficult, would it ?—That would not be difficult.

3428. And it might be done, I suppose, without fear of anybody making a reasonable complaint that too many general officers had been assigned to the Indian staff corps, or too many to the British army. The supersession that you are pointing at is rather the mode in which any system of that sort would work upon the rights of particular individuals, is it not ?—It is. The supersession which I allude to is this, that the younger colonels, for instance, in the Indian staff corps might, by the chances of the service, become promoted to major-general on their lists, superseding, as they say, British officers senior to them on their own lists, in the grade of colonel, or lieutenant-colonel, as the case might be.

3429. If you separated the two lists, and let the two bodies go on upon their respective organisations, which are not the same, you would always, as I gather from you, be in danger of individuals in the one body or the other, getting an apparent advantage of those of a similar rank or a similar number of years service in in the other body ?—Precisely so. That has been the cause of a great deal of unfortunate discussion and agitation of late years, between the officers of the Indian army and the British army.

3430. It was to avoid that that the amalgamation was effected ?—Precisely so, and the colonels of the staff corps were, to their great detriment, thrown back according to their respective rank as colonels being as old, or older officers than the British colonels amongst whom they were placed ; they were thrown back and placed on the imperial list according to their rank as colonels ; and there they are, and all the promotion in the amalgamated list amongst the generals has been given for some years and is now given to the British officers, and they are going up in large numbers ; and three or four years hence it will come to the turn of the staff corps officers, and unfortunately they lie ready there in very large numbers, and there would not be a single British officer promoted, perhaps, for two or three years, which would be a great evil no doubt.

3431. (*Lord Hampton.*) In 26 years from 1879 to 1905, there will have been 205 British colonels promoted against 342 staff corps colonels ?—Yes. The greatest evil is that there would be to begin with such a large batch of staff corps officers to succeed to vacancies, one after another, without a single British officer among them.

3432. (*Chairman.*) I daresay you have considered this subject. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commissioners as to the best way of meeting this evil ?—I proposed a remedy to the War Office in the time of the late Secretary of State, which I believe was considered a good deal, but was not adopted (there may have been good reasons why it should not have been) ; and it was that they should place a limit of age, after which a colonel not promoted should be either retired or should be placed on a supernumerary list of general officers, giving those below him a step. It was reported upon by the actuaries of the War Office in communication with our own actuaries at the India Office, and it seemed to me to be calculated to have the desired effect, of equalizing as near as possible, as near as could be desired, the number of colonels who would be promoted from year to year in each branch of the service to the rank of general.

3433. What was your limit of age ?—I suggested either 61 or 62, in fact, I saw practically from the age of our men that it would remove a very considerable number of them out of the way of promotion, and when they came to work it out in both services, they found that it would strike a large number of staff corps men, but comparatively few in the British army.

3434. Your proposition was that you should take a limit of age, say 61 or 62, and that you should say to every colonel, whether in the British army or on the Indian staff corps, "When you arrive at that "age you must retire from the army altogether ?"—Yes. I proposed at first retirement from the army, but in consideration of various circumstances under which we were placed, I thought that in our service (the Indian service), at all events, we might call them supernumerary major-generals.

3435. Give them a step in rank and put them on a retired list altogether ?—Yes. But that is a matter, as regards the actual result, of very little importance, whether they should be retired, or whether they should be called supernumeraries.

3436. The point would be whether they should not go on to the fixed establishment as major-generals, whatever else you did with them ?—Precisely so.

3437. You say that that particular plan in the circumstances which existed would have had the effect of clearing away a greater number of the Indian staff corps colonels than it would of the British army colonels ?—Yes.

3438. And so it would have tended to equalize the promotion ?—Yes.

3439. (*Major-General Foster.*) What do you mean by "equalize"? Do you mean that the same numbers would under that system go up to be major-generals ? —No ; but giving them a fair proportion for each service.

3440. (*Chairman.*) This, I think, is the paper you refer to. It is a calculation by the actuaries (See Actuaries' Report No. 56, following the witness's evidence), based on the suppositions that the promotion of colonels to be general officers, if retirement were enforced at the ages of 62 and 60 respectively, in the case of all officers who had not reached the rank of major-general ?—Yes.

3441. It is worked out from the year 1874 to 1899, and it says that "The promotions to the rank "of major-general which would fall to the British "colonels and staff corps colonels respectively, would "be as follows." The retirement at the age of 62, in the year 1874, would be 25 British and no staff corps ; in 1875, 24 British and no staff corps ; in 1876, 22 British and no staff corps ; in 1877, 21 British and no staff corps ; in 1878, 18 British and no staff corps ; in 1879, 20 British and 2 staff corps. If the retirement was at 60 it would make some difference ; but still there would be six years, up to the years 1879 or 1880, during which there would be no staff corps colonels promoted ?—Yes ; but that is not owing to this limit of age, but owing to the continued operation of the present system by which all the British officers are now for a series of years getting the promotion. I said for three or four ; that makes it five years.

3442. You must start with 1879, in fact, to see the effect of this proposal ?—Yes.

3443. Then we will take it from that date. Under your proposals, in 1879 there would be, if you retired them at 62, 20 British and two staff corps colonels promoted, and if you retired them at 60 there would be 22 British and no staff corps. In 1880, with retirement at 62, there would be 12 British and seven staff corps ; and with retirement at 60 there would be 15 British and nine staff corps. But without following the figures through, I see that will give a considerably larger number throughout to the British army than to the staff corps ?—Yes, and if your lordship will compare it with the statement here (*pointing to it*) it will show exactly how very powerfully it will operate.

3444. There is a column set opposite, headed "Under existing warrants," which shows the great difference ?—Yes.

3445. Are you aware what the objection was to this plan ?—I never heard any objection beyond a slight allusion to the financial objection on the part of the War Department, but it was never officially discussed. I have had an opportunity of talking it over with the Duke of Cambridge and the late General Egerton, and with Lord Cardwell, and they seemed generally to think that it had a great deal to recommend it; but it dropped and there may have been very good reasons for that that I am not aware of. But I was strong upon this point, that whatever rules and regulations were made to cure an evil which seemed to be inherent for the time in the constitution of the staff corps, it should be done if possible by rules applicable to both services, that some one rule should be made by royal warrant, so that they should both feel that they were under similar rules.

3446. You were saying just now, and one sees that it would be so, that if you were to adopt any system to get rid of this particular anomaly which is threatening us four or five years hence, you would be in danger of altering the position of individual officers and giving them a right to complain, who, as on the staff corps, had been looking forward to their promotion on the fixed establishments, and whose position would therefore be altered by any system which retarded their promotion and gave it to the British army ?—It depends very much upon what the alteration was. If it was, as I said just now, occasioned by a rule introduced by the authority of the Queen for the regulation of the promotion of the whole service, British and Indian, I do not see that any objection could be made to that.

3447. I was thinking in reference to your scheme that, although it might cure the evil, it might leave ground for some of the Indian colonels to object that they had been retarded in their promotions ?—It has so happened that all of our colonels, I think I may safely say all, who would be affected by that rule would under existing regulations have already got the highest rate of allowances, what are called the colonels' allowances, before they became subject to this; therefore they would not be injured substantially in any way, further than being considered disqualified on the ground of age, for anything more than the honorary rank of major-general.

3448. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Then it would only injure royal officers ?—That was the difficulty. They could not put them out (I do not suppose it was proposed), of course, without giving them suitable retiring pensions.

3449. The Indian officers are, as I understand you, colonels of regiments drawing the off-reckonings ?—Yes.

3450. (*Chairman.*) Your opinion, therefore, rather inclines towards some expedient applied to both establishments which would keep the list amalgamated rather than divide it ?—I should prefer that if it could be done.

3451. What are the objections to dividing the amalgamated list and giving a separate establishment to each army ?—Well, the only objection of any force that I see is that which I mentioned just now, that I am afraid that it would be impossible to avoid frequent discussions regarding the supersession which must arise out of the independent promotion on two different lists of two classes of officers eligible to the same commands. Now we have in the British service, different establishments of general officers for different branches of the service, such as the artillery, and the engineers, and the line, and I might add the marines; but I presume it is because the artillery and engineers hitherto have not been appointed to certain high commands that there seems to be but little jealousy felt on either side with regard to supersession. But it has been quite the reverse with the Indian officers, they are eligible to high commands in India, and they are eligible now to high commands anywhere; and therefore if a young colonel by the chances of war, or of service otherwise, is entitled to be a major-general on a separate list in India, and supersedes an older colonel on the British list here, hitherto there has been a very great outcry; and that would certainly happen sometimes with one list, sometimes with the other, if you throw them into two separate lists for promotion, it is inevitable.

3452. It is inevitable, you mean, that if you have two separate establishments and lists altogether, you would have men of similar lengths of service who would nevertheless occupy different ranks on the list, one being higher than the other ?—Yes. Now the present system in its present state is certainly very objectionable; I mean the present system of an amalgamated list, owing to the great number of staff corps officers who are coming forward; it is an abnormal state I may say. Still it has this advantage, that there is no supersession, and each man takes his place on that list according to his colonel's rank.

3453. And it has the further advantage, as I understand you, that if it is maintained in the future it will set itself right ?—Yes.

3454. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) In the remote future ?—Yes.

3455. (*Chairman.*) In your opinion in the remote future the thing will rectify itself, and therefore you are for some expedient which will tide over the present difficulty ?—Yes.

3456. Because you think if the lists are separated that may lead to difficulies of its own in the nature of supersession ?—Yes.

3457. If your system was put into operation would you propose to continue it indefinitely in the future; when the remote future alluded to had arrived would you still continue the system of retiring men at 60 or 62 ?—I think that the propriety or expediency of continuing it would depend upon other considerations, whether it is desirable that the limit of age should be be enforced against officers.

3458. You propose this simply as a temporary measure at present ?—I propose it on account of the present difficulty, but my own opinion is that it would be a very good rule to have for all time.

3459. Let me read this to you from § 11 on page 3 of the paper No. 53. "The rank of colonel is attained "on different principles by the British officers and "the Indian staff corps officers. The British officer "has (speaking generally) a limited establishment of "from 180 to 200 lieutenant-colonelcies, one of which "he must hold for five years before he can become a "colonel; so that if the promised promotion to lieu-"tenant-colonel at the average age of 45 is maintained "a large number of British officers must quit the "service without becoming colonels. The Indian "staff corps officer is not retarded by any limitation to "the number in the rank. The mere continuation of "existence in the service for 31 years will make him "a colonel with right of succession to major-general. "Moreover, voluntary retirement from the higher "staff corps grades has been almost stopped by gua-"ranteeing colonel's allowances (corresponding to, but "better than the British honorary colonelcy) to every "officer of 38 years' service. There are already 173 "such officers against the 148 honorary colonels in "the British service"?—I think there is something said there about the limit of age to lieutenant-colonels.

3460. "A limited establishment of from 180 to 200 "lieutenant-colonelcies, one of which he must hold for "five years before he can become a colonel; so that "if the promised promotion to lieutenant-colonel at "the average age of 45 is maintained, a large number "of British officers must quit the service without "becoming colonels"?—That is an argument based upon an assumption which I know nothing about, nor has it been introduced yet as the rule, I believe, that 45 years limit of age. So that that does not affect the conclusion that I have arrived at.

3461. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) It is not an assumption, it is the average age at which they did attain

Maj.-Gen. Sir T. Pears, K.C.B.

17 June 1875.

that rank ?—There is a mistake here in reference to the inducements to men to hold on to the service. It is a mistake commonly made, and naturally made, because it is not known generally that that is a temporary state of things.

3462. (*Chairman.*) What is the rule which you allude to ?—Officers after 38 years' service having the colonel's allowances guaranteed to them. That was only a rule introduced applicable to officers who had entered the service prior to a certain date, and that will not be a rule applicable when the staff corps has attained to its normal condition.

3463. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) In the remote future ?—In the remote future ; so that I anticipate a large number of officers retiring because that rule would be abolished and they would succeed to a small establishment of colonels' allowances, according to casualties. It is here argued that the officers would not retire, because they have got the colonels' allowances guaranteed to them after 38 years service, and that is the mistake. They are now guaranteed, but they will not be so then. Every officer that entered the staff corps prior to the 12th December 1866 gets that, that is after 38 years service he gets the colonel's allowances, and of course that greatly discourages retirement in the interim, but still we find that there are circumstances which compel men to retire even with that prospect, as they did before.

3464. (*Chairman.*) Have you found that this additional inducement, which is to fall in after a certain number of years' service, has had a great effect in preventing men from retiring as contrasted with the former state of things ?—We cannot doubt that it has ; but at the same time probably more than one half of the usual proportion of retirements have taken place notwithstanding this.

3465. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Was that owing to the extra bonus given by the Indian government ?—No, independent of that. Now we are giving extra bonuses which are moving a great number of these officers out.

3466. (*Chairman.*) But this new regulation of guaranteeing colonel's allowances after 38 years service has had the effect, as I understood you, of reducing the normal retirements by something less than half ?—Yes, I think so. We cannot say to what extent it has operated, but there is the fact.

3467. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Added also to the fact that bonuses no longer existed in the Indian army itself ?—That was one thing also probably which contributed to the result.

3468. (*Chairman.*) You have given bonuses lately with a view of removing some of the older officers ?—We removed 90 last year, and there will be 90 this year probably.

3469. What was the retirement that was offered to them ?—We offered them the present value of their prospective claim to the colonel's allowances according to the number of year's service they had.

3470. You took an actuarial account ?—Yes.

3471. You made the offer either in a lump sum or in a pension ?—Yes.

3472. The operation you performed was one that made no difference to the pockets of the Indian government ?—It was rather a saving in the end, because some of these men were actually unemployed, and therefore drawing handsome pay and doing nothing for it. Others, if employed, were succeeded by subalterns in the staff corps, so that we gave the man what was actually his own, his claim to the colonel's allowance, and we put him on the pension list.

3473. And did his work cheaper ?—And did his work cheaper.

3474. Is there any other objection that occurs to your mind, besides the one that you have indicated, to separating the lists ?—No, except an objection of the same kind, which I may as well mention here, that if those lists were separated, that is to say, if the staff corps officers were thrown into a list of their own for promotion to major-general, it would be necessary to put a stop to that system which now obtains in regard to the promotion of the local officers, for we have a considerable number yet left of officers of the local service who did not join the staff corps, and they are already promoted on a list of their own, and according to a system that has been in operation now for three or four years, the British officers when they are promoted to major-general all receive a back date so as to put them over the heads of the officers of the local Indian list who were their juniors as colonels. Now that system cannot be maintained any longer with a separate list given to the staff corps, because it would place the staff corps and their old brother officers on an inequality.

3475. Would you amalgamate the local list with the staff corps list ?—No. I think that would be rather doubtful ; I think it is as well to let the local list die out on its own footing.

3476. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Would not that evil be remedied if the staff corps, separated from the royal list, had kept to themselves the same privileges as they have now ?—What privileges do you mean ?

3477. If they had the same advantages as they had if they remained in your list, how would there be a complaint in regard to local officers ?—If you superseded by the British officers the officers of the local list you must also do it with regard to the staff corps officers.

3478. I do not see how the British officer does supersede the local officer ?—Every British officer promoted has had a back date given him to the 6th of March 1868. Then I say you must either get rid of that system altogether, or else you must apply the same system with regard to the staff corps officers—either you must give them the same advantage over their brethren on the local list, or else you must give the British officer the same advantage over the staff corps officer.

3479. But if the staff corps officers preserved all the advantages that they have now if they were separated from the royal list, where could the complaint be ?—I do not understand what the advantages are. It is the local officers that would be under the the disadvantage—they would be superseded by the British officers ; and the staff corps officers, unless equally superseded, would have an independent list of their own, and would supersede the local officers. If you were to treat the staff corps officer precisely on the same principle as the British officer, (and that has been since the amalgamation our desire always), and if you give the British officers the privilege of superseding the local officers, as they do now, you must give the staff corps officers the same privilege.

3480. That the staff corps officers have now ?—They have it now, but are they to have it then ?

3481. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Suppose that the next order of things, viz. a separate list of the generals of the staff corps beginning from a prospective date, we will say from the date on which the senior colonel on the amalgamated list would become a general on the fixed establishment ; supposing you removed them from that list altogether, there would be no objection to antedating them, because they would supersede no officer of the Queen's service ; the first batch that would go would go with the date on which they attained that rank, and they would have seniority to all the colonels on the British list ?—That particular batch would be, but how about after-promotion ? In one day you might get another man to jump over the head of a British colonel.

3482. But the same principle of supersession daily occurs now between the different branches of the British army. My idea is that when you arrive at that period, with a fixed establishment for the staff corps, no antedate at all should be given, as it would be unnecessary for the future to stop the cry of supersession ?—Exactly. I am not alluding now to the question of supersession that might arise, but to those particular measures in operation now of giving all the British officers a back date in order to make them supersede men on the local list.

3483. (*Chairman.*) I am anxious to see whether

there is any other objection to separating the amalgamated list, which no doubt would be undoing a work that has been done, and done after some consideration, besides that to which you first alluded, namely, the possible or probable supersession of the officers of the one service, or one branch of the service, by those of the other; and you say, as I understand you, that a consequence of such a step would be that you would have to make some arrangement for the old Indian officers who at present have a separate establishment of general officers?—My intention was merely to explain (I do not think it is an important objection) that if that separate list was made I think the present system, by which British officers when they are promoted have a back date given them to prevent what is called supersession by the local Indian officers, ought to be stopped.

3484. When was that system inaugurated?—It was introduced after the 6th of March 1868.

3485. Was it introduced on the occasion of the staff corps being established, or the amalgamated list being created?—No, it was introduced as a consequence of the discussion that arose on the question of the supersession of the British officers by the officers of the Indian service, not the staff corps, but by what are called the Indian officers generally, and it so happened that when as a part of the amalgamation system we removed the artillery and engineer officers from the Indian list, and placed them on a list of their own, we had, to complete our list, to fill up a certain number of vacancies by promotion from the infantry and cavalry in India; and there was a large batch of officers promoted from the Indian infantry and cavalry, and that gave rise to a great deal of discussion, and at that time they were proposing to give the British officers a back date, far anterior to that which I have mentioned. We disputed that, and said that it was unnecessary, and would lead to a great deal of heart-burning; and ultimately it was agreed that we would take that date of the 6th of March, 1868; and now every colonel of the British service promoted to the rank of major-general, even up to the end of 1874, has a date given him of the 6th of March, 1868, in order that he may go over the head of certain Indian generals who were his juniors as colonels.

3486. It was a measure introduced expressly to prevent the Indian officers from superseding the officers of the British army?—Yes.

3487. Then you say that that would have to be reconsidered or rather to be done away with. How is it, if it were done away with that the Indian officers would not still supersede the British officers?—So they would very likely, but that supersession is becoming less and less important by the system now prevailing, and in a short time would disappear. The promotion now in the Indian army applies to very few, and is comparatively slow, and they have been coming hand over hand upon us lately very quickly.

3488. Then the necessity for the rule will vanish soon?—It will, I hope.

3489. But why should it not be maintained till it does?—Because the position of the staff corps, if they are to have a separate list, will be a false one.

3490. Does not that point to the necessity of some new regulations which would put the staff corps into a similar position with the British army and the Indian army, whose position has been equalized by the arrangement which you have just been describing?—Then you do away entirely with the independence of the staff corps list. Supposing we had this new staff corps list quite independent of the British list, I said I only saw the objection arising from the heart burnings about supersession. I am told there need not be that; a little supersession here and there is of little consequence, and some people say is a good thing; but if they were to adopt with regard to the staff corps and the British service the same system as they have now adopted with regard to the local Indian army and the British list, then you might as well keep the staff corps officers on the amalgamated list.

3491. As far as the interests of the individual officers are concerned, the effect would be the same as the amalgamated list; suppose you were to extend this rule, about giving them the date of 1868, to the staff corps, they having a separate list from the British army, as I understand you to contemplate for the moment, that would equalize the condition of each individual?—Except that you would not persuade the Horse Guards to let it be done on the other side. If a British officer was promoted on his list, being a junior colonel to staff corps officers, you would not get them to let the staff corps officer be antedated over his head, and it would lead to a great deal of complication.

3492. We will assume that it might be done, that justice to the interests of each individual officer might be satisfied by some system that would equalize the officers of each source, one with the other; if you did divide the list you would obtain the benefit of securing only that proportion of general officers which fitly represented the size of the establishments?—Yes, you would ensure that benefit.

3493. There seem to be two difficulties; the one difficulty is that under the existing system you have got a larger number of general officers on your amalgamated list than fairly represents the size of the Indian staff corps?—You will have, no doubt.

3494. And the other difficulty is the individual one; it is the difficulty arising out of men being promoted on two different principles, the system consequently having a tendency to make the men of one establishment supersede the men of another?—Yes.

3495. Now, if you divided the amalgamated list, you could achieve the one object infallibly of securing the right proportion of general officers to the size of each establishment, to the number of combatant officers in each establishment; and then all you would have to do would be to arrange matters that supersession to the individual should not occur. Now that might be done, looking at it from the side of the British army, if this rule of 1868 was applied to the staff corps as well as the British army and the Indian army. But then you say that to work out a complete system a similar rule ought to be applied whenever an Indian officer or a staff corps officer was superseded by a British officer?—I think so.

3496. Might not some system of that sort be inaugurated?—I very much doubt it, but I should be sorry to give an answer off hand, whether a system could be introduced by which two lists could be worked so that the one should never supersede the other.

3497. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Your objection is rather a practical one. You do not see a professional one?—No, I think it would be difficult to work. I am not prepared to say whether it could, or could not be worked.

3498. (*Chairman.*) Speaking generally, do you attach very great importance to the prevention of supersession in individual cases?—Not at all; I think it is rather a good thing.

3499. Why?—I think if you had a service in which there was no supersession it would take away a great deal of life from the service; if there was no hope or fear of certain men getting on quicker than others you would destroy a good deal of the animation in the service.

3500. That would hardly apply to men of different services, would it?—It is the same army, the British army. I think so long as the general principles of organisation are laid down, to give men a fair average of promotion, it is rather a good thing that men should have the hope of getting on a little quicker than their neighbours. That is the great evil, to my mind, of the organisation of the staff corps, that unless men could get brevet rank for service in the field we should never get young general officers. Every man must see at least 31 years' service before he is a colonel, and he will be a man of 40 years' service probably before he is a major-general; and he will not be good for much after that.

3501. You are very much for what may be called

Maj. Gen. Sir T. Pears, K.C.B.

14 June 1875.

inequality for the benefit of the service?—Yes; I think there should be some opening left for men to get on quicker.

3502. May there not be another objection to dividing the amalgamated list, on the part of the Indian officers at least? When they were, so to speak, consolidated with the English army, one feature of that consolidation was this amalgamated list of general officers, was it not, putting them on the same footing?—Yes, but I do not think that the officers of the Indian army ever had their hearts much in it, they did not anticipate much advantage from that amalgamation; and in regard to promotion in the army they certainly did not get it; but Lord Halifax and the Government were, in the early days of amalgamation, extremely anxious to do everything that would consolidate the two services and bring them as much as possible into one.

3503. So as to give them chances of command, and so forth?—Not only that, but to keep up the tone of the Indian service, which had been broken up by the amalgamation and by the re-organisation, and make them all British officers of one class and one service.

3504. But you do not think the Indian officers attach much importance to maintaining their places on the amalgamated list?—I do not think so; I have been some years from India now, but from what I hear and see of Indian officers I do not think they attach very much importance to that.

3505. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Do you say that Indian officers would prefer a separate list?—I do not think that they would care much, so long as they had a fair share of promotion, whether it was on a separate or amalgamated list.

3506. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) These colonels of the staff corps, I suppose, that now make the difficulty are the old company's colonels?—They are all.

3507. And I understand you that when that body of officers has disappeared by a process of natural decay, the difficulty will have very much disappeared?—Very much indeed. Of course I cannot say exactly to what extent the difficulty will be removed; but we have got a scale showing the estimated strength of the staff corps in its different grades when it has attained to a normal state, and that reduces very largely the number of officers of the higher grades.

3508. The staff corps was originally a sort of makeshift to provide for the officers who lost their occupation by the destruction of the Indian army, was it not?—No, the staff corps was a thing that had long been talked of as a fitting substitute to be adopted for the officers who were withdrawn from the regiments in India for employment on the staff; it had been the case for many years that the best officers were withdrawn from the regiments, and the regiments were injured by that; and they said: "You had better have a staff corps for these;" and the first idea no doubt was to form only those officers who were employed on the staff into a staff corps, and the regimental system was to be left as it was. But they soon found that that would not do, that the number of officers on the regimental system would be comparatively small, and it was determined that the whole body of officers in India should be formed into a staff corps, and it became the subject of consideration by a committee under the presidency of Lord Hotham, who made a report as to how it should be organised, and the rates of promotion, and the conditions of service, and so on. But it had to take, in some particulars, a shape not contemplated by that committee; they expected that the staff corps would be merely a corps of officers to be employed on the staff as distinct from the regimental employment; but Lord Halifax and his advisers found it necessary to make the whole of the officers officers of the staff corps.

3509. That was partly in conjunction with the circumstances of the mutiny, was it not?—All these deliberations of Lord Hotham's committee took place after the mutiny some time, but they did not see their way clearly to the future of the Indian army at first.

3510. Then the staff corps may be considered as a permanent element of the working of the Indian army. You could not say, "We will have no staff corps at some given date" without re-adjusting the whole system?—No. I have no reason to believe that it is not a permanent organisation of the Indian army as far as the officers are concerned.

3511. (*Lord Hampton.*) You have just stated to us that you do not think the Indian officers would have any objection to be on a separate list?—I have no reason to think that they would.

3512. I presume it would also be your opinion that the officers of the British army would have no objection to be on a separate list?—I should think none at all.

3513. The amalgamation of the list I presume was made rather with regard to the feelings of the Indian officers than with reference to those of the British army?—I should not think it was made with reference to the feelings of either.

3514. It was with reference to the general advantage of the service?—Yes.

3515. But do not you think that when three or four years have passed, and we begin a system under which in 26 years there would be 342 staff corps colonels promoted as against only 205 British colonels, there would be a strong feeling of dissatisfaction then existing amongst the officers of the British army?—Yes.

3516. To an extent that you would desire if possible to avert?—Certainly.

3517. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You have no objection on principle to that limitation of the age at which colonels should be eligible for promotion to major-general?—None whatever. I do not think it could be applied to the local service.

3518. I was just going to ask you that question?—I do not think it could be applied to the local service; but I do not think happily it will be necessary, for they will be almost young men who will not come under the operation of such a rule.

3519. The guarantee known as Henley's guarantee bars the application to the local army of any rules regarding promotion and retirement which were not in existence at the time that guarantee was given?—Yes.

3520. Going to the principle of the local rank which is given in India, an officer joining the staff corps from the British army after six or seven years' service, not being entitled to substantive staff corps promotion after 12 years, do you think it advisable, or the contrary, that these officers should receive local rank?—I think it is not advisable.

3521. Will you state your reasons?—I think it is not advisable, because as far as I understand the system of local rank and the object, it is a onesided measure, it gives the officer of the British service in India a security against ever being superseded, while the officers of the staff corps are superseded by officers of the British service of the same grade every day. For instance, the officers of the staff corps, to take the lower grades, are compelled to serve 12 years before they can become captains, they have no hope of anything earlier than that; that is supposed to have been the average rate of promotion in the British service.

3522. (*Chairman.*) They can get brevet promotion before that, can they not?—No; in 12 years they get promotion. In consequence of the grievances which the breaking up of the old Indian service into the staff corps and the local service gave rise to, we gave brevet rank to the local service after that 12 years, and at the same time local rank to the officers of the British army, but it was on the understanding that when all the subalterns of the local army disappeared the system should be discontinued. That was acceded to by the Commander-in-Chief at the Horse Guards. But the result of the local rank is this, that there may be officers of the British service of six, seven, or eight years who may be captains, and they have manifestly superseded the staff corps officers who cannot be captains till 12 years; but if you introduce a rule by which local rank shall be given to every British officer after 12 years, the staff corps officers are in the position which I have described and they will be liable to

supersession every day, and they cannot supersede anybody. Therefore I think if it was taken as an average it should be left to be considered as an average, and the British service left to take their chance with them; some will be more fortunate and some less, though probably very few indeed, for the local rank given now under those rules to the British army is I think very rarely required.

3523. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I should like to ask you a question in regard to one element of the staff corps service which has given rise to a good deal of discussion, and that is the eligibility for promotion of lieutenant-colonels of the staff corps, who are in the performance of purely civil duties, whether it would be right that they should attain, quite without reference to the nature of their duties, the rank of colonel in the army, and become eligible in their turn to promotion to general officers. What is your opinion generally as to the advisability or not of retaining that rule?—I think it would be difficult to get rid of the rule now for those who are in the service as far as regards promotion to the rank of colonel, as it is in the staff corps warrant; they have passed from the local service into the staff corps most of them, and a great many of them with that understanding, and I should be rather sorry to see that disturbed; but I do not see why rules should not be passed to prevent their getting higher than colonels, unless they perform a certain amount of military duty within a certain period.

3524. Would you like to name a period?—Well, I am hardly a competent judge of that, but I should say that a man should have commanded a regiment, for instance, for three years, and within a certain definite number of years, say within the last six or seven years, or should not be considered eligible for the rank of major-general.

3525. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Or an equivalent staff appointment?—Yes; but I should like to see any rules of that kind which are introduced, introduced as general rules for the whole of the British service under which the staff corps officers would come. I should not like to see any rule of that kind introduced for the staff corps officers alone.

3526. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I think you will probably admit that the Indian Government, and therefore the whole country, has benefited very largely by the power of taking men from civil employments and giving them military positions?—Most decidedly. Most of the distinguished men that we have had in the field have been men who have passed a great part of their life in civil or political duties; there is no doubt about that.

3527. It would be unadvisable therefore on that ground to bar the power of the Government to employ such men?—I think on that ground it would certainly. These men, though they have been very distinguished, have been, as we know, relatively few in number, and the Government know, from the very beginning, which are the men likely to serve their purposes.

3528. I fancy that some of the most eminent names in Indian history have been military men taken from civil employment?—They have.

3529. Supposing that on the report of this Commission a new system of retirement for the British Ordnance regiments were established, do you think there would be any objection to giving officers of the Indian artillery and engineers the option of availing themselves of any such system?—Of course the Commission will understand that I can only speak for myself, and that I cannot speak for the Secretary of State in Council; but I think most decidedly that with regard to any rules of that kind introduced for the benefit of the old corps of royal artillery and engineers, the new body of Indian artillery and engineers ought to have the option of retiring under the same rules.

3530. And probably, if the recommendations of this Commission were based upon the idea that the retirements would improve the Service, there would be still less objection on the part of the Indian government?—I should think so. I should think it just to the officers. The officers themselves, though they have perhaps derived some benefit, have suffered a good deal of loss from parting company with the old Indian service, and therefore I have always thought they should have all the benefits from the union with the royal artillery and with the engineers that could possibly be given them under the regulations.

3531. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) The officers of the Indian artillery at present, I believe, supersede the officers of the royal artillery, and I presume you are aware that great dissatisfaction exists in the old royal artillery on that account?—I am not aware of that.

3532. Are you aware that that supersession takes place?—No, I am not. I know that such things have taken place, but I know that we had some difficulty in preventing supersession in the other direction, as regards the Bengal artillery, the other day. There were a certain number of majors of artillery promoted to lieutenant-colonels, and we contended that lieutenant-colonels of the Bengal artillery should be promoted also to prevent supersession. We had some difficulty in carrying it out, but it was done.

3533. I believe some lieutenant-colonels were promoted?—Yes.

3534. And the captains to replace the lieutenant-colonels were promoted to be majors from the Indian list?—Yes.

3535. Did not these officers supersede all the majors?—I cannot say.

3536. May I ask if you consider that there would be any objection to an amalgamated list of lieutenant-colonels in the artillery?—I should think so. I do not think that these amalgamated lists would give satisfaction. I am not encouraged from the experience I have had of amalgamated lists to hope for much contentment from them. You generally find that some men must be injured by the amalgamation, and those men of course make a great outcry. But, however, I should be glad—if it were seriously considered, and if my opinion were desired—that I may have an opportunity of looking more into it.

3537. An officer in the artillery on the Indian list promoted to the rank of major-general, is antedated similar to major-generals in the line, is he not?—He is.

3538. Thus an officer of the late Bengal, or Madras, or Bombay artillery would, when promoted, supersede not only the officers of the royal artillery, but also the officers of the Indian army and staff corps, who had been senior to him previously?—Quite so.

3539. Is there any reason why the officers of the Indian artillery should be antedated?—There is, I believe, a reason, but it is a reason much better known to the Horse Guards than to me. It arises out of their system of maintaining their list of general officers. They must get exactly the same privileges that the officers of the old royal artillery would whatever they may be. The officers of the old royal artillery do just the same I believe.

3540. But, if I understand you rightly, the o ffices of the Indian artillery gain the advantage of being promoted by their own list, on the system of separate lists?—Yes.

3541. And they also gain the advantage of being antedated?—So do the officers of the old royal artillery; they are promoted on their separate list, they are antedated.

3542. You objected in your evidence just now to the officers of the staff corps superseding the officers of the local corps if they were on a separate list?—I do not think that I made any objection of that kind. I merely suggested that the system to which I referred in my evidence just now would create much greater heart-burning between the officers of the staff corps and the local service than anything that can arise from the few occasions of promotions of the old officers of the Indian artillery who belong to a different part

Maj.-Gen. Sir T. Pears, K.C.B.

14 June 1875.

of the service; I do not think they are analogous cases.

3543. Do you consider it an advisable plan that officers in a seniority corps who may be serving together in the same garrison, or even in the same brigade, should supersede one another?—No; it is impossible if they are in a seniority corps.

3544. The artillery, I believe, is a seniority corps?—Well it is unfortunately just now four seniority corps, and therefore it is more in the position as regards promotion of four regiments of the line serving together.

3545. But these officers of the four different corps are in different brigades, are they not, or they may be all serving in the same brigade, and officers of each of the four corps?—No doubt they may be.

3546. And they might be serving in the same garrison?—No doubt they might; but as I said before they are not a seniority corps, they are four seniority corps.

3547. (*Chairman.*) There being a general design, as far as possible, to bring these four corps into one body, owing to their being separately organised, with a seniority list in each of them, it may happen that a man in one of them, though of much younger service than another man in another of them, may nevertheless take the command of that man?—Yes.

3548. And the proposition is to get rid of that evil?—I say that is not so serious an evil after all; but at the same time it leads to the first question put, whether these four bodies might, or might not, be amalgamated. No doubt if you had one body, one profession, one branch of the service, it would be better; but it is one of the results of this difficult process of the amalgamation of two armies which is in a transition state just now; but by-and-bye the difficulty will disappear and there will be one corps. The Indian cadres are dying out, and when they do they will be all one; as the captains are disappearing gradually so it will go on to the top. As I said before, regarding the amalgamation of these lists, the difficulty arises from the fact, that it would materially injure the prospects of certain officers on certain cadres. Their promotion is dependent upon their immediate seniors in their cadres, and if you amalagamate all these lists you destroy their prospects of promotion, and bring them all on to one dead level, but the scheme itself otherwise in principle is decidedly good if it could be done.

3549. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I imagine that when it was first proposed to amalgamate the Indian artillery and engineers with the royal artillery and engineers, the point was considered, whether it was feasible to amalgamate the officers, or not?—I should think it was, but it was before my time in the office, and therefore I cannot say to what extent that was considered; but I have no doubt if it had been they would have seen that it was impracticable.

3550. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) Here is the very case that has been alluded to. There were "eight majors "of the late Bengal list who had completed 25 years "of service who were promoted to be lieutenant-"colonels, and thus equalized in position with officers of "the same standing on the royal list; but this necessi-"tated the promotion of eight captains to the rank of "major in the regiment on the Bengal list who were "nearly two years junior to the senior captain on the "royal list, and were commissioned in the same year as "the 74th royal captain on that list." This state of things creates great dissatisfaction in the artillery. Do you think it would be possible to have an amalgamated list of lieutenant-colonels; I mean not below the rank of lieutenant-colonels?—I would rather not give a decided answer to that; it is a very difficult question to answer off-hand; there are a great many difficulties which attend amalgamations of this sort. I have mentioned one difficulty, the extreme dissatisfaction it would cause to individual officers in those cadres.

3551. But the extreme dissatisfaction takes place amongst all the officers of the old royal artillery?—But after all, their promotion in itself is not retarded.

3552. But they are commanded by men who entered the army after them; there is a man 74 down the list of captains who cannot be promoted for many years to be a major, and has been superseded by a man of his own standing?—But the fact alluded to is a thing of every day occurrence in our army, and I should say in every army.

3553. (*Chairman.*) Brevet rank produces the same result?—Yes; but it is the consequence of independent promotion of the different regiments, and you will never cure it until you put the whole army on one general list; that is not desirable. But, at the same time, there is this difference, if you keep them as they are, the officers of one cadre—no matter which it is, now it is a British, to-morrow it may be an Indian—will be dissatisfied at being what they call superseded by men on another list. But, on the other hand, their own promotion has not been positively effected or retarded one single hour by these measures; but if you amalgamate all the list, then you will find that Indian officers who all their lives have had a fair prospect of promotion on their own cadres, have those prospects destroyed at once.

3554. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) But in your case you give the officer the advantage of promotion on the local list, and you give him the advantage that the English colonels have got of superseding as generals the local officers?—As British officers they go with the British officers, of course that cannot be helped.

3555. You give him the advantage of both; you give him the advantage of the royal artillery in one case, and you give him the advantage of the local list in the other?—I do not consider that advantage of going up on a separate list to be a gain, it is what they had in possession.

3556. But then they supersede the English officers in that way as generals?—They do not supersede any English officers as generals; I think they only move up with them.

3557. They come to be general officers years before the colonels in the artillery of the same rank?—That is the accident of the promotion on their list being fast, while the promotion on the home list of artillery might be just the same: it happens to be very slow just now.

3558. (*Chairman.*) There is nothing in the system, as I understand, which will bring about either with certainty or with any probability, supersession on the one side or on the other?—Nothing whatever. It is a system that has been adopted by the War Office authorities here, to have a separate list of general officers for the separate branches of the services, and of course as long as they are separate there must be separate action and independent results.

3559. (*Major-General Foster.*) I think you told us that the vast number of staff corps colonels was owing to the older officers of the Indian army going into the staff corps having a certain rank at the time?—Yes.

3560. But would you tell the Commission what rule exists in the staff corps to enable a lieutenant-colonel to become a colonel, and in what time he becomes a colonel?—Five years, all of them.

3561. Whether he is on furlough or not?—Yes.

3562. If such is the rule in the staff corps, the rule being in the British service that a man must qualify and hold a certain position as lieutenant-colonel before he becomes a full colonel, must not the staff corps always throw up to the top a larger proportion of colonels than actually is the case in the British army in proportion?—I do not think it follows; it depends upon the number of lieutenant-colonels which you have in the staff corps from which to derive these colonels, and that depends upon the result of the peculiar organisation of the staff corps.

3563. I say, according to the present organisation of the staff corps, it must always have a larger number of colonels than a similar number of officers in the British army; is not that so?—I do not think so. I

do not think it follows, because the rules in the British army render the number of colonels in their service very variable. The number of colonels on the staff corps obviously depends on the number of lieutenant-colonels from time to time.

3564. Assuming that the number of lieutenant-colonels are the same in both services, and that the British have two-thirds more officers than the staff corps, you would have more colonels on the staff corps in proportion than you have in the British army?—On that assumption; but we do not know that the number of lieutenant-colonels in the staff corps is or will be equal to the number in the British service.

3565. I mean a larger proportion?—If it proves in the end (for really we do not in our transition state exactly know what will be the result) that the number of lieutenant-colonels apportioned to the whole is larger in the staff corps than it is in the British Service, then, under the present rules, they will have an undue proportion of colonels.

3566. If the number of lieutenant-colonels was equal in proportion, would not the staff corps then throw up to the top a larger number of colonels?—They would, under the present rules.

3567. You mentioned, and I confess I could not quite understand it, that under no circumstances did you think the staff corps colonels would have any antedate given to them in case they were superseded by the local army?—Yes.

3568. They would have now, being amalgamated with the British army, would they not?—I suppose they would.

3569. Therefore, if they were removed from the list, there would be no additional right to have that any more than at present?—No.

3570. You have stated that you thought that if the staff corps were removed from the list, it would be necessary to do away with the present regulation which gives to the British colonel an antedate?—Yes.

3571. Then there is a necessity to do away with it now?—No, I think it is on that account that when you made a separate list for the staff corps to have independent promotion, it would be necessary, in order to make things smooth, to do away with that antedating.

3572. Do you think it would render things smooth when you remember the reports of Lord Cairns' commission and Sir William James', which represent the supersession by the local army as the great grievance?—That may be true, but we have adopted measures now which have retarded promotion in that army.

3573. Your said, and that frightened me, that there would be no necessity for something or other, because the colonels of the local Indian army will all be young men?—They will be hereafter. At present they are old men.

3574. Hereafter they will supersede the British army more than ever?—But they will be very much slower in their promotion; and supersession has not reference to the age of the officer, but to his standing as a colonel. The promotion depends on the relative number of staff corps officers on that list, and as we get lower in the service that becomes larger, and therefore the promotion of the local colonels becomes more and more rare every year, so that, although they will be young men, they will be old colonels.

3575. The last 68 officers of the local army will be major-generals?—Yes.

3576. And many of them will attain it at an early age?—Yes, but they will be old colonels. The question of age is one which the Horse Guards in these descriptions generally keep out of sight. They will be in my estimation very old colonels but young men.

3577. Supposing that it was thought advisable to separate the staff corps from the royal list, what steps would you recommend to be taken; would you stop the promotion of the British colonels now on a vacancy occurring, should it be a staff corps vacancy, or would you keep those steps in abeyance until it came to their turn, according to their rank, to be general officers, and then promote them all; or would you advise the immediate promotion of the number of vacancies that are due to the staff corps, I think about 27; would you promote the staff corps colonels in that number at once?—I think it would be better to leave them till their turn comes.

3578. And stop the promotion of the British officer?—Yes. You will have to absorb the British list ultimately.

3579. The supernumeraries now will have to be reduced to some small proportion?—Yes, it is of no use making more supernumeraries.

3580. The expense of any extra major-generals now has fallen to the English Government?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned.

Actuaries' Report, No. 56.

On the Question of Promotion to the Establishment of General Officers, as affected by a Compulsory Retirement.

1. The Secretary of State directed us to calculate what would be the effect on the promotion of Colonels to be General Officers if retirement were enforced at the ages of 62 and 60 respectively, in the case of all Officers who had not reached the rank of Major-General.

2. We have traced under these two hypotheses, and under the present system without alteration, the course of promotion until the last survivor of the Lieutenant-Colonels of 1871 shall have become a General Officer. We cannot go beyond this point, because the inducements to retire by sale may be expected to differ from those obtaining in past experience, in the case of Officers promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel subsequently to the Abolition of Purchase.

3. We have assumed that any measure of forced retirement made applicable to the British and Indian Staff Corps lists would be applied equally to the list of Indian Local Officers. We have also assumed that any new system would commence from the 1st January 1874.

4. We believe that the last surviving Lieutenant-Colonel of 1871 would become a General Officer—under the existing Warrants, in 1899; with retirement compulsory at 62, in 1889; and with retirement at 60, in 1888.

5. The promotions to the rank of Major-General which would fall to the British Colonels and Staff Corps Colonels respectively, would be as follows:—

Year.	Under existing Warrants.		Retirement at 62.		Retirement at 60.	
	British.	Staff Corps.	British.	Staff Corps.	British.	Staff Corps.
1874	25	—	25	—	25	—
1875	24	—	24	—	25	—
1876	23	—	22	—	21	—
1877	23	—	21	—	19	—
1878	19	—	18	—	18	—
1879	21	—	20	2	22	—
1880	14	9	12	7	15	9
1881	1	18	10	11	13	5
1882	11	9	12	6	10	8
1883	9	11	10	9	10	8
1884	7	14	10	9	12	6
1885	9	12	7	12	10	9
1886	8	13	8	11	6	13
1887	9	13	8	12	11	8
1888	6	16	11	10	10	9
1889	3	20	13	8		
1890	5	19				
1891	9	16				
1892	12	14				
1893	3	23				
1894	—	28				
1895	13	15				
1896	13	17				
1897	4	26				
1898	8	23				
1899	6	27				

6. The average number of Officers of each list (*i.e.* British and Staff Corps respectively), on the establishment of General Officers would be as follows:—

Year.	Under existing Warrants.		With Retirement at 62.		With Retirement at 60.	
	British Generals.	Staff Corps Generals.	British Generals.	Staff Corps Generals.	British Generals.	Staff Corps Generals.
1874	294	46	294	46	294	46
1875	303	45	303	45	304	45
1876	311	43	311	43	311	43
1877	317	42	316	42	316	42
1878	322	40	320	40	318	40
1879	325	39	323	40	323	39
1880	326	42	323	43	325	41
1881	316	54	318	50	323	47
1882	305	65	313	57	319	51
1883	298	72	307	63	313	57
1884	289	81	301	69	309	61
1885	280	90	293	77	303	67
1886	272	98	284	86	295	75
1887	264	106	276	94	287	83
1888	255	115	269	101	282	88
1889	244	126	265	105		
1890	232	138				
1891	223	147				
1892	218	152				
1893	209	161				
1894	195	175				
1895	186	184				
1896	184	186				
1897	177	193				
1898	168	202				
1899	159	211				

NOTE.—The proportion, according to Establishment, would be 275 British Generals to 95 Staff Corps Generals.

7. The retirements occurring annually, *in excess of such retirements as now occur*, would be :—

Year.	With Retirement at 62.			With Retirement at 60.		
	British List. Retiring as		Staff Corps List.	British List. Retiring as		Staff Corps List.
	Colonel.	Lieutenant-Colonel.	Retiring as Colonel.	Colonel.	Lieutenant-Colonel.	Retiring as Colonel.
1874	23	12	9	25	19	12
1875	1	2	4	3	3	13
1876	1	2	4	8	3	10
1877	3	2	6	8	1	12
1878	10	1	9	2	1	12
1879	5	1	11	2	2	23
1880	1	—	9	6	2	24
1881	4	1	16	5	1	20
1882	5	1	23	8	3	33
1883	5	—	22	6	2	39
1884	8	1	28	6	2	46
1885	8	—	31	5	2	45
1886	6	—	39	4	3	36
1887	6	—	48	1	2	31
1888	8	—	33	—	2	17
1889	3	—	29			

8. The total number borne each year on the British and Indian Retired Lists respectively, *over and above* any retired establishments now provided, would be :—

Year.	With Retirement at 62.			With Retirement at 60.		
	British List. Retiring as		Staff Corps List.	British List. Retiring as		Staff Corps List.
	Colonel.	Lieutenant-Colonel.	Retiring as Colonel.	Colonel.	Lieutenant-Colonel.	Retiring as Colonel.
1874	21	11	8	24	17	11
1875	23	13	11	26	20	20
1876	23	14	14	32	22	29
1877	24	15	19	38	23	39
1878	28	15	26	40	23	50
1879	36	15	35	40	24	67
1880	36	15	44	42	25	91
1881	37	15	46	46	25	110
1882	39	15	72	51	26	137
1883	41	15	91	56	27	170
1884	46	14	112	59	27	207
1885	51	14	137	61	28	244
1886	56	14	166	62	29	267
1887	58	13	202	61	29	292
1888	62	12	233	59	29	315
1889	63	12	252			

9. Not having been informed of the terms to be accorded to Officers retiring, we cannot state the probable cost; but if we assume that, as in the analogous cases of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, Officers retiring as Colonels will have 600*l.* a year, and those retiring as Lieutenant-Colonels 365*l.* a year, the charge will be as follows for British Officers who have entered into this calculation. These charges will be *in excess* of the sum now borne for retired pay; but, as in the case of that sum, a portion of the charge will fall upon Indian revenues. These retirements, however, on the British list would tend to reduce the amount payable by the Commissioners for abolishing Purchase below the maximum of 8,000,000*l.*, estimated for it in 1871.

Year.	With Retirement at 62.	With Retirement at 60.
	£	£
1874	16,615	20,605
1875	19,545	22,900
1876	18,910	27,230
1877	19,875	31,195
1878	22,275	32,395
1879	27,075	32,760
1880	27,075	34,325
1881	27,675	36,725
1882	28,875	40,090
1883	30,075	43,455
1884	32,710	45,255
1885	35,710	46,820
1886	38,710	47,785
1887	39,910	47,185
1888	41,580	45,958
1889	42,180	

It is to be observed that this charge would refer solely to those Officers who were already Lieutenant-Colonels or Colonels at the time Purchase was abolished, There would be a further charge (which we cannot determine) in respect of the Officers who have attained, or may attain, the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel subsequently to that date. Moreover, nothing is here provided for compulsory retirements below the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; nor can this retirement be considered in any way the measure of what may be required, in the absence of the Purchase System, to accelerate promotion in the lower ranks.

10. The estimated service at which Colonels would, on an average, become General Officers, would be as follows:—

Year.	Under existing Warrants.				With Retirement at 62.				With Retirement at 60.			
	British List.		Staff Corps.		British List.		Staff Corps.		British List.		Staff Corps.	
	Service.	Age.	Service.	Age.	Service.	Age.	Service.	Age.	Service.	Age.	Service.	Age.
1874	39	57	—	—	35	53	—	—	35	53	—	—
1875	38	56	—	—	36	54	—	—	36	54	—	—
1876	39	57	—	—	35	53	—	—	34	52	—	—
1877	36	54	—	—	35	53	—	—	35	53	—	—
1878	37	55	—	—	35	53	—	—	35	53	—	—
1879	37	55	—	—	36	54	42	60	35	53	—	—
1880	39	57	50	68	38	56	42	60	35	53	37	55
1881	40	58	47	65	35	53	39	57	33	51	39	57
1882	39	57	45	63	34	52	41	59	34	52	41	59
1883	39	57	45	63	37	55	41	59	34	52½	40	58
1884	40	58	44	62	36	54	42	60	35	53	39	57
1885	38	56	46	64	37	55	42	60	35	53	40	58
1886	41	59	46	64	37	55	41	59	37	55	39	57
1887	42	60	46	64	37	55	41	59	35	53	38	56
1888	43	61	48	66	37	55	39	57				
1889	42	60	47	65								
1890	43	61	48	66								
1891	46	64	49	67								
1892	47	65	48	66								
1893	48	66	51	69								
1894	—	—	49	67								
1895	50	68	51	69								
1896	50	68	49	67								
1897	52	70	51	69								
1898	48	66	52	70								

11. It is to be observed that the probable results in promotion of the present system, as shown in this paper, are wholly irrespective of the recent abolition of Purchase; since only those Officers who held the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel or Colonel at the time that Purchase was abolished are included in this calculation. It would thus appear that if it be an evil to have an establishment of General Officers of great age, some remedial measure would have shortly become necessary even if Purchase had continued in operation.

12. The results given have been very carefully derived from the experience of the 14 years ending with 1873. They are stated in a collected form in the Table annexed. The mode of using the data, and the data themselves, are shown in the Appendix.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
4th October 1873. ROBERT DAVEY.

RECAPITULATION.

Year.	PRESENT SYSTEM; NO FORCED RETIREMENT.								FORCED RETIREMENT AT 62.														FORCED RETIREMENT AT 60.												Year.
	Vacancies.			Promotion.			Number on Generals' List.		Vacancies.			Promotion.			Number on Generals' List.		Number of Retirements.			Number on Retired List.			Vacancies.			Promotion.			Number on Generals' List.		Number of Retirements.			Number on Retired List.			
	British.	Staff Corps.	Local.	British.	Staff Corps.	Total.	British.	Staff Corps.	British.	Staff Corps.	Local.	British.	Staff Corps.	Total.	British.	Staff Corps.	British. Colonels.	British. Lieut.-Colonels.	Staff Corps Colonels.	British. Colonels.	British. Lieut.-Colonels.	Staff Corps.	British.	Staff Corps.	Local.	British.	Staff Corps.	Total.	British.	Staff Corps.	British. Colonels.	British. Lieut.-Colonels.	Staff Corps.	British. Colonels.	British. Lieut.-Colonels.	Staff Corps.	
1874	16	1	9	25	—	25	294	46	16	1	9	25	—	25	294	46	23	12	9	21	11	8	16	1	9	25	—	25	294	46	25	19	12	24	17	11	1874
1875	16	1	8	24	—	24	303	45	16	1	8	24	—	24	303	45	1	2	4	23	13	11	16	1	8	25	—	25	304		3	3	13	26	20	20	1875
1876	16	1	8	23	—	23	311	43	16	1	8	22	—	22	311	43	1	2	4	23	14	14	16	1	8	21	—	21	311	43	8	3	10	32	22	29	1876
1877	16	2	7	23	—	23	317	42	16	2	7	21	—	21	316	42	3	2	6	24	15	19	16	2	7	19	—	19	316	42	8	1	12	38	23	39	1877
1878	16	2	7	19	—	19	322	40	16	2	7	18	—	18	320	40	10	1	9	28	15	26	16	2	7	18	—	18	318	40	2	1	12	40	23	50	1878
1879	17	1	7	21	—	21	325	39	16	1	7	20	2	22	323	40	5	1	11	36	15	35	16	1	7	22	—	22	323	39	2	2	23	40	24	67	1879
1880	17	2	7	14	9	23	326	42	16	2	6	12	7	19	323	43	1	—	9	36	15	44	16	1	7	15	9	24	325	41	6	2	24	42	25	91	1880
1881	17	2	—	1	18	9	316	54	16	2	7	10	11	21	318	50	4	1	16	37	15	46	16	2	—	13	5	18	323	47	5	1	30	46	25	110	1881
1882	17	3	—	11	9	20	305	65	16	2	—	12	6	18	313	57	5	1	23	39	15	72	16	2	—	10	8	18	319	51	8	3	33	51	26	137	1882
1883	17	3	—	9	11	20	298	72	16	3	—	10	9	19	307	63	5	—	22	41	15	91	16	2	—	10	8	18	313	57	6	2	39	56	27	170	1883
1884	17	4	—	7	14	21	289	81	16	3	—	10	9	19	301	69	8	1	28	46	14	112	16	2	—	12	6	18	309	61	6	2	46	59	27	207	1884
1885	16	5	—	9	12	21	280	90	16	3	—	7	12	19	293	77	8	—	31	51	14	137	16	3	—	10	9	19	303	67	5	2	45	61	28	244	1885
1886	16	5	—	8	13	21	272	98	16	3	—	8	11	19	284	86	6	—	39	56	14	166	16	3	—	6	13	19	295	75	4	3	36	62	29	267	1886
1887	16	6	—	9	13	22	264	106	16	4	—	8	12	20	276	94	6	—	48	58	13	202	16	3	—	11	8	19	287	83	1	2	31	61	29	292	1887
1888	16	6	—	6	16	22	255	115	17	4	—	11	10	21	269	101	8	—	33	62	12	233	16	3	—	10	9	19	282	88	—	2	17	59	29	315	1888
1889	16	7	—	3	20	23	244	126	16	5	—	13	8	21	265	105	3	—	29	63	12	252															
1890	16	8	—	5	19	24	232	138																													
1891	16	9	—	9	16	25	223	147																													
1892	16	10	—	12	14	26	218	152																													
1893	16	10	—	3	23	26	209	161																													
1894	16	12	—	—	28	28	195	175																													
1895	15	13	—	13	15	28	186	184																													
1896	16	14	—	13	17	30	184	186																													
1897	15	15	—	4	26	30	177	193																													
1898	15	16	—	8	23	31	168	202																													
1899	15	18	—	6	27	33	159	211																													

NOTE.—The Officers included in this Table are limited to those whom ad attained the rank f Lieutenant-Colonel prior to the Abolition of Purchase.

APPENDIX.

DATA EMPLOYED.

13. The first data necessary for this calculation were the ages of the General Officers, Colonels, and Lieutenant-Colonels of the British, Indian Staff Corps, and Indian Local Lists respectively.

14. As regards the General Officers, in the absence of precise information, we assumed that, on the average, they had entered the service at the age of 17. This assumptiou gave as their ages on the 1st January 1873 :—

Age.	British List.	Indian Staff Corps List.	Indian Local List.
97	1	—	—
91	—	—	2
90	1	—	2
89	—	—	1
88	—	—	1
87	1	—	—
86	2	—	3
85	3	—	2
84	1	—	1
83	5	—	2
82	5	—	4
81	3	—	1
80	5	—	2
79	6	—	1
78	5	—	1
77	5	—	2
76	2	—	2
75	3	—	2
74	3	—	1
73	4	—	6
72	4	—	9
71	8	—	11
70	12	2	13
69	8	—	11
68	8	—	1
67	5	1	1
66	10	2	3
65	27	1	3
64	13	6	6
63	9	1	1
62	14	2	4
61	7	2	2
60	4	1	—
59	5	1	1
58	16	1	—
57	11	1	—
56	12	1	1
55	14	2	2
54	8	3	4
53	7	6	2
52	10	3	1
51	4	—	3
50	4	6	—
49	3	2	—
48	1	1	—
47	1	2	—
46	2	1	—
41	—	—	1
	282	48	116
		446	

It was necessary to follow the lives of these Officers on the three Lists separately, in order to estimate the vacancies which would fall to the several Lists of Colonels. For this purpose we used Mr. A. G. Finlaison's life table, based on the experience of Government annuitants. Subsequently, feeling that the applicability of this table might be thought too great an assumption, we traced the actual mortality of all British General Officers who were on the List in 1820, or who subsequently attained the rank. We found that their mortality differed so little from that of Government annuitants that Mr. Finlaison's table might continue to be used with very close accuracy.

15. In dealing with the Lists of Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels, we obtained from the India Office the actual ages of the Staff Corps Colonels. The Indian Local Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels, and the Staff Corps Lieutenant-Colonels, we assumed at 17 *plus* their service. For the British List, we obtained from the Military Department the ages of a considerable number at the top of the list; but to ascertain these took so long, and threatened so seriously to retard what must inevitably be a very lengthy calculation, that we assumed the rest; taking as our basis the average ages on entering the service given by those Colonels whose ages have been furnished to us. This average we found to be 18 for the Infantry, and 19 for the Cavalry.

16. The promotions to the rank of General Officer would fall to the senior surviving Colonel as follows :—

a. A vacancy among the British General Officers to the senior Colonel of the Amalgamated List of British and Staff Corps Colonels.

b. A vacancy among the Staff Corps General Officers—in the same way as a British vacancy.

c. A vacancy among the Indian Local General Officers—would fall to a local Colonel, if he happened to be the senior on the joint List of Staff Corps and local Indian Colonels. If, however, the senior on that joint List of Colonels should be a Staff Corps Colonel, then the vacancy would fall to the senior Colonel on the Amalgamated List of British and Staff Corps. This arrangement is to continue until the Indian Local List of General Officers shall be reduced to 73;* after that time the succession to the Indian Local Generals will be limited to Indian Local Officers, who will constitute a wholly distinct body until they die out.

17. In considering the manner in which the Colonels will come up for promotion to General Officers, it was necessary to take into account the diminution of the list from causes other than death, as retirement, sale, &c. No mortality table being available, we had to reduce the ratio of depletion at each age, or at each year of service in the rank, from actual experience; and as these Officers serve on conditions essentially the same as before Purchase was abolished, the experience of the 14 years ending 1873 does, we believe, give a fair criterion of their future movement. At least, we see no mode of obtaining a better ratio.

18. As regards the Colonels of the Staff Corps and Indian Local Army, and the Lieutenant-Colonels of the former, we employed a table, showing the total diminution at each year of age, which we had previously prepared in conjunction with Major-General

* This is the expected effect, and is stated for the sake of simplicity; the regulation lays down that the process shall continue till the Staff Corps and British Generals together (including the Staff Corps Officers already General Officers), who shall have succeeded to Indian or Staff Corps vacancies, shall equal 1 in 28 of the total number of Staff Corps Officers.

Hannyngton, from the actual experience of all the Officers in the Staff Corps during the 11 years which have elapsed since their formation.

For the British Colonels we ascertained by the experience of 10 years the proportion who quitted the Army (from any cause) in each year after becoming Colonels.

We found that of:—

520	who had been under	1 year	in the rank, there remained after	12 months		492
494	"	from 1 to 2	"	"	"	473
452	"	" 2 to 3	"	"	"	429
410	"	" 3 to 4	"	"	"	395
626	"	" 4 to 5	"	"	"	591
549	"	" 5 to 6	"	"	"	517
475	"	" 6 to 7	"	"	"	447
398	"	" 7 to 8	"	"	"	383
339	"	" 8 to 9	"	"	"	328
266	"	" 9 to 10	"	"	"	258
195	"	" 10 to 11	"	"	"	186
117	"	" 11 to 12	"	"	"	114
51	"	" 12 to 13	"	"	"	50

The decrement in each case would be that caused by death, retirement on the present retired full-pay, or sale of Commission.

19. Having cleared off, by promotion and the above depletion, the Colonels who held that rank on the 1st January 1873, it became necessary to form a further list of Colonels from the then Lieutenant-Colonels of the British List, and Staff Corps List respectively, in the order, as near as possible, which they may be expected to hold. To do this, we considered that the Staff Corps Lieutenant-Colonels would become Colonels within the 6th year after becoming Lieutenant-Colonels; as they have, with few exceptions, in the past.

For the British List great irregularity prevails as to the period at which the rank of Colonel is attained. The experience of 10 years gave the following result, on which we acted:—

Of 936	with service from	0 to 1	year there remained in	12 months	861,	and there had become Colonels,		0
847	"	1 to 2	"	"	782	"	"	0
790	"	2 to 3	"	"	742	"	"	0
757	"	3 to 4	"	"	681	"		32
692	"	4 to 5	"	"	426	"	"	242
416	"	5 to 6	"	"	287	"	"	70
267	"	6 to 7	"	"	196	"	"	44
180	"	7 to 8	"	"	121	"	"	35
107	"	8 to 9	"	"	81	"	"	12
75	"	9 to 10	"	"	60	"	"	7
54	"	10 to 11	"	"	45	"	"	3
40	"	11 to 12	"	"	29	"	"	6
24	"	12 to 13	"	"	17	"	"	4
8	"	13 to 14	"	"	7			
5	"	14 to 15	"	"	5			
5	"	15 to 16	"	"	2			
2	"	16 to 17	"	"	1			

War Office, Pall Mall, Monday, 5th July 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, K.C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.
THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Colonel ROBERT PARKER RADCLIFFE examined.

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

3581. (*Chairman.*) You are deputy adjutant-general of the artillery, are you not?—I am.

3582. Have you been long in that position?—No, only for two months.

3583. We wish to have some information from you with reference to the present system of retirement in force for the artillery, and the extent to which that present system is effective and satisfactory. At present am I right in supposing that in the Royal Artillery there is no retirement either voluntary or compulsory until a man has completed 25 years' service?—There is none, except that they can retire upon half pay under 25 years' service upon Medical Board.

3584. The lowest number of years' service, having completed which, a man is at present entitled to retire is 25 years, is it not?—Yes.

3585. And for any lower number of years' service there is no voluntary or compulsory retirement?—No.

3586. (*Lord Hampton.*) Only by Medical Board?—Only by Medical Board, and then on half pay.

3587. (*Chairman.*) When 25 years' service has been completed do I understand that an officer of any rank is entitled to retire upon half pay?—Yes, it is unlimited.

3588. And upon the half pay of the rank he fills at the time he retires?—Yes.

3589. Is he entitled to any step of rank at that time?—No.

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

3590. The next period of retirement is after 30 years' service, is it not?—It is.

3591. An officer is then entitled to retire upon the full pay of his rank, is he not?—Yes, upon the full pay of his rank.

3592. So that if he is a major, he will retire upon the full pay of a major; and if he is a lieutenant-colonel, he will retire upon the full pay of a lieutenant-colonel, which is, I believe, 350*l.* a year?—That is less than the real pay; he is granted a 1*l.* a day if he is a lieutenant-colonel with 30 years' service, but he cannot get anything under the 30 years.

3593. What is the full pay of a major?—It is 292*l.* per annum.

3594. At any rate a major retiring at 30 years' service is entitled to the full pay of a major, as you have already stated?—Yes.

3595. And a lieutenant-colonel is entitled to 350*l.* or 360*l.* a year?—Yes, to 365*l.* per annum.

3596. If he is a full colonel, what then?—If he is a full colonel and has 30 years service he may retire upon 600*l.* a year; he actually gets 600*l.* a year, but only 474*l.* is taken out of the vote of 42,400*l.* which is granted for full pay retirement.

3597. A man who has completed 30 years' service, and who at the time when he proposes to retire is a full colonel gets 600*l.* a year?—Yes, subject to a slight actuarial deduction.

3598. But the whole of that 600*l.* a year is not taken out of the 42,400*l.* which is voted by Parliament for annual retired pay applicable to the artillery?—That is so.

3599. How much is taken out?—474*l.* is the full pay of a colonel, or 1*l.* 6*s.* a day, that is taken out of the 42,400*l.*, but the balance between that and the 600*l.* is taken from another vote; that is calculated in rather a curious way. We were supposed to have got advantages by the warrant of 1872, and there was a sort of calculation made with reference to the advantages that each officer would gain from that warrant. Each officer's case is taken separately; in some cases it only reduces his pay 3*l.* or 4*l.* a year.

3600. An estimate was made of the pecuniary position of each officer, as it was affected by the warrant?—Yes, it is made when an officer applies to retire by an actuarial calculation of the advantages he has gained by the operation of the R. W. of July 1872.

3601. And the deductions that are made, as I understand you, are made conformably with the amount of benefit that the individual may be supposed to attain?—Yes.

3602. What advantages did the warrant of 1872 to which you allude give?—It gave an unqualified right to retire after 40 years' service upon the full pay of 600*l.* a year to unattached general officers and regimental colonels, but nobody has taken advantage of that. It also gave the advantage before referred to, viz., that for each full pay retirement of a regimental colonel of 30 years 474*l.* 10*s.* only is chargeable to the 42,400*l.*, the difference between the 474*l.* 10*s.* and 600*l.*, or whatever sum the actuaries calculate the officer retiring is entitled to, being a gain to the retired full pay vote, which has the effect of giving *five* retirements where money for *four* only was available under the previous warrant.

3603. But when he does retire owing to this calculation, and the way it is worked out and acted upon he does not get the full 600*l.* a year?—No; and as the junior officers get up to the position at which they would be entitled to retire, they would get still less.

3604. Now we will pass to the next retirement, namely; retirement after 40 years' service. In regard to that, I believe the system is that any man, whether he is a colonel or general officer, may retire without limitation of numbers upon 600*l.* a year?—That is so.

3605. Am I right in understanding you as saying that nobody has taken advantage of that?—Nobody has taken advantage of it.

3606. Is there any other retirement to which the officers in the artillery are entitled?—I think I mentioned the retirement upon half pay after 25 years' service.

3607. We have got the retirement upon half pay after 25 years' service; we have got the retirement upon full pay after 30 years' service, and we have now this rate of retirement of generals and colonels after 40 years' service; is there any other rate of retirement?—There is also the retirement upon medical certificate under 25 years' service.

3608. Is there anything else?—There is nothing else.

3609. Have those retirements naturally effected a reasonably rapid flow of promotion?—Certainly not.

3610. You think they have failed?—I think they have failed.

3611. Do you think that is the general opinion of the officers of the artillery?—I think so, certainly. I think I can show by some returns I have here, how that system has failed.

3612. Has the sum of 42,400*l.* voted for the establishment of the retired full pay of the British arms been absorbed?—It has not. Since 1869 it has been going begging sometimes.

3613. Have you any idea out of the 42,400*l.* a year how much in a year has been left unclaimed?—Up to 1867 the balance in any one year left unappropriated never amounted to sufficient for one retirement. Since 1867 there has been occasionally a balance, reaching in one instance to 1,800*l.*, but it very soon was taken up. I can give in a return of the number of steps which have taken place.

3614. Will you hand in that return?—I will.

The same was handed in and was as follows:

RETURN shewing the number of retirements on Full Pay for the Royal Artillery from 1858 to 1872.

——	On £600 per annum.	On £400 per annum.	On full pay as Lieutenant Colonel.	——
1858	1	—	—	
1859	—	—	1	
1860	2	—	—	
1861	2	—	—	
1862	2	1	—	
1863	5	—	—	
1864	5	—	—	
1865	3	—	—	
1866	2	—	—	
1867	10	—	—	R. F. P. Vote increased by £10,000.
1868	9	—	—	Since the R. W. 1872
1869	3	—	1	the retirements upon
1870	—	—	2	F. P. has been as
1871	2	—	—	follows:
1872	2	—	—	1873 - - 3
				1874 - - 4
				1875 - - 2

3615. You have handed in a return showing the number of retirements on full pay for the royal artillery from 1858 to 1872. It appears that in 1858 there was one retirement upon 600*l.* a year, and no other retirement. In 1859 there was one retirement on full pay as lieutenant-colonel. In 1860 there were two retirements on 600*l.* a year. In 1861 two retirements on 600*l.* a year. In 1862 there were two retirements on 600*l.* a year and one on 400*l.* a year, almost all the rest down to 1872 are upon the 600*l.* a year scale; but I notice that in 1867 the number that retired upon 600*l.* a year jumped up from five, which was the largest there had been before that year, to ten, and in 1868 to nine?—There was an increase in the amount voted, it formerly used to be 32,000*l.* and then it was increased to 42,000*l.*

3616. Then it would seem that up to that year there had been men waiting to retire if the fund had been large enough ?—Yes.

3617. Since the 1872 warrant the retirements upon full pay have been as follows: 1873, three; 1874, four; and 1875, two. You say those pensions are not satisfactory, and that the men do not take them ?—They are unsatisfactory because they are taken principally by younger officers, if I may call them young; they wait for their full colonelcy and then retire. Those who have got up to the top of the list or pretty nearly to the top of the list, go on in the hope of arriving at the rank of colonel commandant.

3618. What is the position of a man when he has arrived at the rank of full colonel ?—He is then in the receipt of 1*l.* 6*s.* a day, which is 474*l.* a year.

3619. He has some allowances as well, has he not ?—Yes, he has his 6*s.* a day, and he has forage for two horses, and lodging allowances and servants, which make up a good deal more.

3620. Upon the whole his position is better than 600*l.* a year ?—Yes

3621. And to retire after he is a full colonel would be practically a loss to him ?—Yes, it would.

3622. (*Lord Hampton.*) Could you say how much it is altogether ?—I have not got the figures, but it is easily added up. He has 6*s.* a day command pay, and forage for two horses, which would be about 5*s.*, which would make 37*s.*, and two servants, which I look upon as worth 60*l.* or 70*l.* a year.

3623. You say that the forage would be 5*s.*?—It is 1*s.* 10*d.* in barracks, but it is 2*s.* 4*d.* per horse if he has to find his own stabling.

3624. (*Major-General Johnson.*) I think you have never had a very large amount of surplus money; that is to say, money unaccepted ?—Only since 1867. For instance, this year we have money enough to retire four officers; it is only two or three days ago I got in applications for three officers to retire.

3625. (*Mr. Welby.*) I believe some of them commuted their pensions; does not that leave a certain amount free ? I see that out of 42,400*l.*, the amount which is appropriated is 40,411*l.*, of which 1,530*l.* represents three officers who have commuted their pensions. I do not know whether you keep an account of the officers who have commuted their pensions ?—The commutation of an officer's retired pay does not affect the amount of the vote for retired full pay available for retirements, the amount of such officer's retirement being debited to the vote. We keep a list of officers who have commuted.

3626. You would not count that sum as three pensions ?—Yes, as three retirements already appropriated.

3627. (*Chairman.*) You adhere to what you have stated that these retirements are not taken up to the full ?—Not generally; here is an instance of it this year.

3628. You were also saying that another evil is that those who do take them are not the oldest officers whom you would wish to take them, but younger men who wait till they reach the rank of full colonel, and, being anxious to retire for some reason of their own, take them; is that so ?—Yes.

3629. Now, with regard to the retirements at 30 years' service. You have been speaking of retirements at 40 years' service ?—It is the same thing, except that after 40 years' service it does not come out of the vote of the 42,000*l.*

3630. You speak generally of the 600*l.* a year which is open to men to retire upon to the extent of the 42,000*l.* ?—Yes.

3631. Now, with regard to retiring upon half-pay after 25 years' service, is that a right which is largely availed of ?—It is a thing which is hardly ever done. I may exemplify the difficulty by a case which is before me now of an officer with 28½ years' service. He is in bad health, and has nothing to fall back upon, except his half pay, and it seems hard to force him out when, by waiting another year and a half, he would be able to retire upon full pay.

3632. Your proposition is, that it will not serve a man's purpose to take half-pay at 25 years' service when, by serving five years more, he can get the full pay ?—Exactly.

3633. What is the result of this upon your regimental promotion ?—There is great stagnation, especially amongst the majors and captains. I have just drawn up a statement of proposals for promotion, which I beg to hand in.

The same was handed in, and is as follows:

"Proposed Scheme for the Promotion and Retirement of Officers of the Royal Artillery.

"General Officers.

"That the number of general officers now allowed for the royal artillery, viz., 32, be increased in proportion to the number of officers added to the regiment since the royal warrant, dated 3d November 1854.

"In 1854, when the above number was fixed as the general officers' establishment, there were 674 combatant officers in the royal artillery; at the present date the number upon the old list is 945 (inclusive of supernumeraries, for whom promotion has also to be provided) being an increase of 271.

"2. That the separate establishment of general officers for the ordnance corps be discontinued, and promotion to this rank made general by the promotion of the senior colonel on the Army List to any vacancy that may occur, irrespective of the particular branch of the service to which the officer causing the vacancy may have belonged.

"Regimental Colonels.

"To retire compulsorily at 58 years of age on 600*l.* per annum, if not previously promoted to the rank of Major-general.

"Officers below the Rank of Regimental Colonel.

"1. To have an unqualified right to retire upon an annuity with a step of honorary rank. The annuity to be calculated according to length of service upon the following scale:

No. of Years' Service.	Probable Age.	Annuity. £	Remarks.
22	41	250	
23	42	275	
24	43	300	
25	44	325	
26	45	350	
27	46	375	Compulsory at 50 years of age for such lieut.-colonels as have not attained the rank of regimental colonel.
28	47	400	
29	48	425	
30	49	450	
31	50	475	
32	51	480	
33	52	495	
34	53	510	
35	54	525	
36	55	540	
37	56	555	
38	57	570	

"2. Officers under 22 years' service reported unfit for general service from disability caused in and by the service, to have an unqualified right to retire upon half pay.

"Employed Officers.

"That the present system of making officers holding certain staff appointments supernumerary to the effective establishments be extended to all employments, except where held by lieutenants.

"Looking to the abnormally large batches of young officers commissioned to the royal artillery, consequent upon augmentations made to the regiment during the Crimean war and Indian mutiny, there are at this date 74 majors, whose average age is 38 years, with only a year's difference between the senior and junior in point of service.

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

"The captain's list is affected in the same degree:

"The first 80, average age 37 4/12 years:

Service - { Senior, 19 3/12 years. Junior, 16 6/12 years.

Age - { Senior, 37 7/12 years. Junior, 34 6/12 years.

"The next 104, average age, 35 years:

Service - { Senior, 16 3/12 years. Junior, 14 years.

Age - { Senior, 34 11/12 years. Junior, 33 5/12 years.

"The junior 43, average age 32 10/12 years.

Service - { Senior, 14 years. Junior, 13 1/12 years.

Age - { Senior, 33 11/12 years. Junior, 34 7/12 years.

From which it will be seen that, between the senior of the 74 majors before referred to and the junior captain there is but a difference of two years and eight months in age, whilst there are 300 steps between the two.

"With a view to break up this block, it is proposed that some special inducement should be offered to buy out some of the officers forming these large batches, as was done under the royal warrant, dated 31st May 1871.

"If upon the new organization of the Ordnance Department positions could be provided for a number of the captains, it would, in some degree, effect this object, and would have the further advantage of economy and benefit to the service by retaining young officers possessing a large amount of professional knowledge.

"Coast Brigade.

"At present there is no retirement laid down for the coast brigade, which is officered by men commissioned from the ranks at a generally advanced age, the average age on appointment being 42 years.

"The establishment is

10 captains and
16 lieutenants,

and it becomes necessary to lay down some rules for the retirement of these officers, as the whole of the seniors are men of advanced years and very long service.

"It is proposed that any officer of the coast brigade who shall have completed 30 years' service, 12 of which shall have been commissioned service, shall have an unqualified right to retire upon the full pay of his rank, such retirement being in all cases compulsory at 55 years of age.

"After the retirement of those officers now serving, who would be affected by the above age limit, the number of retirements should be restricted to three captains every two years."

3634. It is the inevitable or natural consequence of a large number of men being added to the body at the same time, that they go forward as a mass?—Yes, they came in in batches of 80 and 90.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Number of Officers who have joined the Royal Artillery in each year from 1844 to 1874, and the Number now serving who joined in those years.

	1844.	1845.	1846.	1847.	1848.	1849.	1850.	1851.	1852.	1853.	1854.	1855.	1856.	1857.	1858.	1859.	1860.	1861.	1862.	1863.	1864.	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Number joined.	29	21	40	67	29	35	35	30	32	24	49	91	73	73	23	63	81	72	35	52	81	46	48	50	48	42	41	69	27	68	61
Number now serving.	13	11	15	25	6	17	19	19	17	12	29	56	43	43	13	34	58	44	33	35	55	30	40	38	33	35	39	67	27	68	60

Horse Guards, War Office, 1 July 1875. R. P. Radcliffe, D.A.G., R.A.

3635. Have you considered this stagnation of promotion, and in connection with it any scheme by which it may be remedied?—The first thing that we ought to get is an increase to the number of our general officers. The number of general officers in 1858 was fixed at 32, when it became a fixed establishment. Since then we have had an increase of 271 officers. In 1854 there were 674 combatant officers in the Royal Artillery. At the present date the number upon the old list is 945 (inclusive of supernumeraries, for whom promotion has also to be provided), being an increase of 271.

3636. You say that since your number of general officers was fixed at 32 you have had an increase of officers to the number of 271?—Yes.

3637. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) That is nearly 50 per cent.?—Yes, from 674 to 945.

3638. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Will you explain how those increases took place?—We had an augmentation of one brigade in 1855, another was added in 1860. In 1858–9 there were various additions on account of batteries sent to India and China, and later we have had additions to the horse and field artillery.

3639. (*Chairman.*) You say that owing to that increase you think there ought to be an increase to the number of generals upon the establishment?—Yes.

3640. Have you fixed upon any number which you think should be added?—The calculation amounts in proportion to about 12.

3641. That would be your first proposal?—Yes, that would be my first proposal.

3642. Have you any other proposal to make?—I propose that the separate establishment of general officers for the ordnance corps be discontinued, and promotion to this rank made general by the promotion of the senior colonel on the army list to any vacancy that may occur, irrespective of the particular branch of the service to which the officer causing the vacancy may have belonged; that is to say, they should be thrown into the general list.

3643. Is that a proposal that all the branches of the service, the infantry, the cavalry, the artillery, and the engineers should have one establishment of general officers?—Yes, as it used to be; to throw those general officers who are now 32 when we get an increase into the fixed establishment of general officers of the army, and then to take our chance.

3644. You would promote from the senior colonel upon the list?—Yes.

3645. Whatever branch he happened to belong to?—Yes.

3646. Then if promotion happened to be more rapid in one branch than another, that branch would get a larger share of general officers?—We must take our chance of that.

3647. Then unless you can arrange the branches so that promotion shall be tolerably even you might do injustice to particular branches?—It would do away with one injustice which exists at present. People talk about being superseded by one branch and another. When a man became a senior colonel he would take the next step amongst the general officers.

3648. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do I understand you would have no artillery general officers?—Not specially. We should have our number.

3649. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) You would not have your number if promotion was more rapid in the infantry?—Supposing we were to get a large addition to the 32, and they were thrown into the whole number of the officers of the army, we should get our share.

3650. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) How many officers do you say there are in the artillery?—974.

3651. Does that include the generals?—Yes, it includes the generals.

3652. (*Chairman.*) What other proposal have you to make with regard to the question of promotion?—I have a proposal to retire compulsory full colonels

on reaching the age of 58, upon 600*l.* a year if not previously promoted to the rank of major-general, and this is to prevent such a block as we have now; perhaps it will not often be necessary.

3653. Do you think it better to fix the age or the number of years' service?—I think it is better to fix the age.

3654. What is the next proposal that you have to submit to the Commission?—Then I propose that all officers below the rank of regimental-colonel should have an unqualified right to retire upon an annuity with a step of honorary rank, the annuity to be calculated according to length of service, upon the scale which I have just handed in. This scale is Mr. Childers's scale, which he proposed in the report of his committee, it is exactly the same except that I have put the age differently; he calculates the age at 42 after 20 years' service, I put it one year earlier.

3655. Still you adhere to the number of years' service?—Yes.

3656. But you count the age differently from Mr. Childers because you do not agree with him as to the age at which service commences?—Quite so.

3657. (*Lord Hampton.*) That would apply to all ranks, would it not?—That would apply to all ranks.

3658. (*Chairman.*) What you propose is, retirement upon Mr. Childers' scale according to the number of years' service?—Yes; that is to cover all the different ranks.

3659. You do not propose to go below 22 years?—I do not.

3660. Those are voluntary retirements?—Yes.

3661. Have you any proposal to make with regard to compulsory retirement?—Nothing beyond what I have mentioned with regard to colonels at the age I have specified. Then I propose, under 22 years' service, a man reported unfit for service from disability caused in and by the service should have an unqualified right to retire upon half pay.

3662. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) That is what is now the rule?—Yes, on the recommendation of a medical board.

3663. (*Chairman.*) Is that the whole of your proposal?—No; I propose that the present system of making officers holding certain staff appointments supernumerary to the effective establishment be extended to all appointments, except where held by lieutenants.

3664. You would second all supernumeraries?—Yes. For instance, I myself am not on the supernumerary list now; I am taken away from it.

3665. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Are there many upon the supernumerary list now?—Yes there are, and we have been varying them lately according to the 25 years system.

3666. (*Chairman.*) Are the artillery subject to the rule which prevails in the line with respect to the number of years during which a lieutenant-colonel shall hold his commission?—No; the rule is five years in the line.

3667. Do you see any reason why that rule should not apply to the artillery?—I do not like the rule at all for anybody.

3668. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) But it does apply to the colonels, does it not?—No; only to district appointments. They are not put out of the regiment.

3669. (*Chairman.*) You do not approve of the rule, I understand?—No.

3670. Although it may not be for the benefit of the individual, still, if it acts for the benefit of those below him by making a vacancy, are there not some merits in that system?—There may be some merit in it, but I think it is a little hard after an officer has worked up to the summit of his ambition—five years is a very short time to allow him to keep that rank.

3671. Are there any special considerations which you know of which belong to the artillery upon that subject as distinguished from the line?—I think an officer of artillery placed on a retired list for a considerable time would lose much professional knowledge and his efficiency would be affected. This applies especially at the present time, owing to the great strides that are now taken in questions affecting the artillery service, both as regards personel and material.

3672. I notice that in the whole of the scheme you have no proposition for creating vacancies in the lower ranks, either voluntarily or compulsorily—that is to say under 22 years' service?—I have not.

3673. What would you say of some scheme which should offer to men who may be desirous of going away such a sum as might enable them to go away before 22 years' service had been completed?—I do not think there is any great advantage in it. I think that under 22 years' service officers should not be entitled to much pension.

3674. Looked at in that point of view one can understand it, but if it is looked at in another point of view, namely, creating promotion—suppose it could be done by the state as cheaply as the pensions you propose later in the service, would you still object to it?—I think the system of Mr. Childers' retirement would clear the middle ranks sufficiently to prevent a block of the lower ones.

3675. Let me ask you this—Suppose a man has got 25 years' service, he can retire, according to this scale which you have proposed, upon 325*l.* a year, and if that man waits five years more he can get 600*l.* a year?—That is so.

3676. Do you think that 325*l.* a year would tempt an officer to retire?—There are many things which would induce a man to retire; ill-health and bad stations, for example.

3677. There are a good many who would go, no doubt, and probably might go under any circumstances; ill-health might compel a man to retire. Now I see after 30 years' service there are 450*l.* put down as an annuity, but at present you offer 600*l.*, and the men do not take it?—But that is not unlimited; it is only to the amount of the 42,000*l.*

3678. But they do not come up to that figure?—There are many cases where an officer of 30 years, being only a lieutenant-colonel and entitled under existing regulations to 365*l.* per annum, would retire if he could make more than the present rate, and this deterrent cause my proposal would meet. At present officers in this category wait for their promotion to colonel, when they will get 600*l.* rather than go upon the 365*l.* as lieutenant-colonels.

3679. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) The 600*l.* a year very seldom becomes available for men of only 30 years' service, does it?—Those are just the men who are getting it now. Of the three who are taking it now, Colonel Vesey, who obtained his commission in 1843, is the oldest; he has 32 years' service. Colonel Ommaney is waiting until Colonel Vesey has retired (he is the head of the lieutenant-colonels) in order to get his 600*l.* a year. Immediately he is promoted he retires—at least, he said he would retire immediately he got his promotion, and he is the lowest upon the list.

3680. He is the senior lieutenant-colonel?—Yes, and he would be the junior colonel; he could not otherwise get the 600*l.* a year.

3681. What I wished to remark was that the 600*l.* a year pension has seldom been available for men of only 30 years' service?—I do not think it has until lately, but a great many of our colonels now are very nearly the same age as the lieutenant-colonels.

3682. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) But that is due to extraordinary circumstances, is it not—the Crimean war, and various other things, lifted up a great many men?—Partly so, but the cause extends further back than the Crimean period. The reduction after the Peninsular War left a large number of old officers in the regiment, and eventually they were got rid of at very much the same time, and consequently a number of young officers of nearly the same age entered the regiment and rose together.

3683. (*Chairman.*) But that must always be so when there has been anything which has carried away a large number of officers, and there has been a large influx at the same time?—No doubt.

3684. Supposing you were preparing a scheme for

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

promotion and retirement in the army generally, are there any special considerations which you think ought to be borne in mind respecting the artillery as distinguished from the infantry of the line?—There are none that occur to me.

3685. The stagnation now is amongst the captains?—The stagnation now is amongst the captains and lieutenant-colonels too.

3686. What number of years' service is your oldest captain?—His first commission is in 1856.

3687. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) There is no stagnation at the present moment; it is future stagnation that you dread, is it not?—I think there is stagnation now. There are 15 majors whose first commissions were in 1850.

3688. (*Chairman.*) That would give 25 years' service?—Yes.

3689. Would you call that stagnation? What would you consider a normal standard of promotion? After how many years' service do you consider a man ought on the average to become a major?—Yes, it is stagnation. I consider that majors should be promoted after 24 years' service, captains after 16, and lieutenants after 10.

3690. That is much more rapid than the line?—I do not know what the rate of promotion is there.

3691. The general figure which has been given has been something like 18 years to become a major, and 25 years to become a lieutenant-colonel; if your 15 senior men have only got 25 years' service, that would not seem to be out of the way?—The stagnation is not so great now as it will be.

3692. When will it come about that there will be stagnation?—I think it is rather a hopeless case for the junior captain. Amongst the colonels I have marked between Colonel Hawkins and Lieutenant-Colonel Byrne there are 87 officers with only a difference of six years service between them; that is a very hopeless case for Lieutenant-Colonel Byrne.

3693. If I understand you rightly, the evil you anticipate is one which would really be due to this circumstance of a number of men joining at or about the same time; if that had not happened, and if the flow of promotion instead of coming with a rush in that way had steadily gone forward, is there any reason to suppose that the present system would not have given a flow of promotion equal to the standard which we have been talking of?—I think there are very few opportunities for officers to retire under the present system.

3694. At all events those opportunities, although they have not been fully availed of, have brought men of 25 years' service to the top of the majors' list?—Not so much the opportunities to retire, as the various abnormal measures resorted to to give promotion.

3695. Would that facilitate promotion?—It has given us more officers.

3696. Then has the present state of things, although not perhaps unsatisfactory with regard to the general state of promotion, been brought about by the late augmentations?—Partly so.

3697. These augmentations have taken place since what time?—The 14th and 15th brigades were raised in 1855 and 1860, and the reorganization took place in 1859. A depôt was established, and there was an increase in 1871 to the horse and field artillery.

3698. What proportion did the total number of these augmentations bear to the previously existing force?—There were two additional brigades, the 14th and 15th.

3699. That is as two to thirteen brigades?—Yes.

3700. These remarks tend to show that the Artillery has not been in what may be called a normal state for some time, owing to the augmentations which have delayed the promotion of a large number of officers who have been added to the lower ranks who all come forward for promotion at the same time. These are all disturbing influences upon the general run of promotion, are they not?—They are.

3701. (*Lord Hampton.*) Referring to what you stated with regard to retirement, I understand that you would allow all ranks to retire, but not without the condition of 22 years' service?—Quite so.

3702. When the noble chairman pressed you about that, I understood you to adhere to the opinion and not to see any advantage in allowing junior officers to retire at shorter periods of service. Now, if the 22 years were dispensed with, and officers were allowed to retire down to a much shorter period of service, as low as 10 years; for example, do not you think that the effect of such a system must be very much to increase the flow of promotion?—Yes; it would, of course. Many officers who do not care about the service would leave it comparatively young when they saw an opening to some other profession or occupation.

3703. Is it not your opinion that if such a system were adopted, probably a considerable number of officers would avail themselves of it?—I think they would.

3704. Do not you think that that would give you just what you desire, namely, an increased flow of promotion?—It would be so low down in the list that it would not affect the artillery very much; it would be among the subalterns principally, and it would be principally clearing out one subaltern to let another in.

1705. Are you right in saying that it would be principally amongst the subalterns. If it were as low as 10 years, would not that include some captains?—Not at the present rate of promotion, as the subalterns are now and for some time have been of a service of 13 years before promotion.

3706. (*Chairman.*) Would not that tend to relieve the difficulty which you find, namely, that you have a block of men all about the same standing, if you had men retiring amongst that class that would tend to make them more various in their periods of service?—It would reduce the number of officers of the same age no doubt.

3707. (*Lord Hampton.*) As I understand, that is what you wish to arrive at?—But what we are likely to suffer from is the present block amongst the majors and captains which has been caused by the Crimean War and the Mutiny in India.

3708. Could you give me about the average service of the majors and captains?—I have a return of them here. The captains are all under 20 years' service. (*The witness handed in the Return* (*No.* I.) *which is appended to his evidence.*)

3709. (*Chairman.*) Would not these voluntary retirements, which offered an opportunity to young men to leave the army and go out into civil employments in life, be more specially adapted to those who have the training and education which is required in the artillery than to the line; would they not be able to get civil employment more easily?—Perhaps they would.

3710. (*Lord Hampton.*) You propose, I think, to make compulsory the retirement of all full colonels of 58 years of age?—Yes.

3711. Would not that have the effect of exciting a good deal of dissatisfaction amongst the officers who were compelled to leave their service at that age?—I think that when they had completed about 39 years' service, they would very seldom be found to complain.

3712. There is no precedent, I think, in any branch of our service for compulsory retirement at so early an age as 58?—I am not aware how that may be; but it was my opinion that it would be desirable.

3713. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Would it be possible to introduce the five years' rule into the artillery, which exists in the line, because if it were, that would clear off your upper ranks?—I presume you mean putting them on half-pay.

3714. Not necessarily putting them upon half-pay, but—to apply the same rule to the artillery as we do to the line—majors and lieutenant-colonels must go from active service in the line after five years' active service in that rank?—But there are no regimental colonels in the line, so that if we had that rule some men would never arrive at the rank of colonel.

3715. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Would there be any

objection to applying the five years' system to the colonels even though it were not applied to the lieutenant-colonels, limiting their tenure of command and their place in the regiment to five years, and after their five years either placing them upon half-pay with the power of rising to the rank of major-general, or giving a permanent retirement, and a step of honorary rank?—That would no doubt cause promotion, but I do not approve of it.

3716. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) I wished to know whether the rule was practically applicable to the artillery and, without considering the consequences to individual officers, I understand your opinion to be that, if applied in some form, it would give a flow of promotion?—I think it would.

3717. (*Lord Hampton.*) Would it or would it not be beneficial to the royal artillery that those lieutenant-colonels should be dealt with as the lieutenant-colonels and the majors are dealt with in line regiments?—I do not think it would be because a man might for some years be promoted to the rank of colonel before he was employed as a colonel. If a man is put in command of his regiment he would be put into employment at once, whereas a colonel of artillery might be five years without being employed; there might be no command vacant or open to him.

3718. The difference arises from the practice that in the royal artillery officers are promoted to the rank of colonel to fill vacancies in a limited number?—Yes.

3719. (*Chairman.*) Then upon the whole I understand you are not of opinion that the five years' rule could be beneficially applied either to the lieutenant-colonels or to the colonels of the artillery?—I do not think it could.

3720. (*Lord Hampton.*) Do you think, without dwelling longer upon the five years' rule, which has been adopted for the line, that it would be advantageous to the royal artillery that some limit in point of time should be attached to holding the command of an artillery brigade?—Full colonels do not hold commands of brigades now, they hold merely commands of artillery districts; until this year they did hold commands of brigades, and they went with their brigades to foreign service or wherever it might be, but now they are dissociated from their brigades, and are merely posted by the commander-in-chief to such commands of districts as he thinks proper.

3721. I thought that applied only to the junior of the two colonels who are attached to the brigade?—To the one that is employed of the two colonels.

3722. Is there only one colonel in command of a brigade?—Brigades are now commanded by lieutenant-colonels.

3723. Who commands the brigade?—The senior lieutenant-colonel.

3724. Is it the rule that he must be a lieutenant-colonel, or may he be a colonel?—He must be a lieutenant-colonel, a full colonel could not hold the command.

3725. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I see in a paper handed in to Mr. Childers's Committee by General Adye, he says: "The very fact that the present "condition of the corps has been produced chiefly by "large augmentations, and by their pushing up into "the higher ranks men comparatively young in years "is in itself a proof that unless some outlet is given "the subalterns of the present day will have to endure "a stagnation much similar to that which crippled "the regiment for so many years subsequent to Water-"loo." That, I think, is what you anticipate under the existing condition of things?—It is.

3726. Have you ever had any actuarial calculation made with reference to the prospects of promotion under the existing circumstances and conditions of the officers now in the regiment?—No.

3727. How many colonels must necessarily remain unemployed from there being no command for them?—I could supply that information, but I have not got it here. In another list we have it shown how many commands we have, and how many are not employed.

3728. Will you show the Commission how many must remain unemployed?—(*The information asked for is given in the Return No. 2 appended to Colonel Radcliffe's evidence.*)

3729. A paper has been put into the hands of this Commission called a suggestion for the promotion of officers of the royal artillery. Have you read that paper?—I have.

3730. Are you aware that when the officers of the Indian artillery volunteered for the royal artillery, and when they were made royal artillery it was distinctly stated that promotion in the different regiments should go on in those regiments?—Yes, I believe so.

3731. That was distinctly laid down?—I believe so.

3732. Very much in the form of a guarantee?—I believe it was, and I have no doubt that you know that it was so.

3733. Then to depart from that principle now would be to introduce a new system of promotion which was not calculated upon by the officers when they volunteered for the royal artillery?—It would.

3734. Another point I want to ask you with regard to that paper which advocates promotion by length of service in the rank of lieutenant-colonel is this: Say a senior major upon the Bombay list was a few months junior, or even a few days junior, to the senior major upon the old royal list, it was proposed to give the senior major of the old royal list promotion upon the Bombay cadre because he was that short time senior to the Bombay officer,—there may be some eight or nine or ten men of exactly the same date of first commission at the top of the majors of the old royal artillery,—would it not in your opinion be very hard that the senior major of the Bombay artillery should be kept out of his promotion until all that batch of royal artillery majors was promoted?—It would appear hard, certainly, but it would cut both ways.

3735. The Bombay artilleryman having, moreover, paid a very large sum towards the promotion which is given to a man in another list?—Yes, that would be so.

3736. (*Mr. Welby.*) In the alterations made in 1872 I see it is provided that colonels and lieutenant-colonels holding certain appointments should be made supernumeraries whenever the senior majors should exceed 25 years' service; could you say how many of such appointments there are which would come under that rule?—I do not know that I could tell you the exact number. I think there are not above eight or ten such officers.

3737. Therefore that does not afford any great relief?—No; and besides that it is only temporary, because as soon as the 25 years' majors are promoted the next step that comes, we are obliged to absorb those that will be made supernumerary in the list, so long as there is not a man at the top of the majors who has 25 years' service. That has happened this last year; we got a relief of seven or eight majors; they have since been absorbed, but now we have, as I told you before, six or seven at the top of the list, and eight more coming on in December; but we are not allowed to carry that rule out any further until this commission has reported—the privilege has been stopped.

3738. But supposing that rule was in operation at the present moment, would you be able to carry off many of the senior majors under that rule?—I do not think we should get quite the 14.

3739. You would get a certain number?—Yes.

3740. Therefore to a certain extent there is relief if that rule were in action?—There is a temporary relief.

3741. Not only a temporary relief, but as long as there is an officer of 25 years' service at the top of the list it is a permanent thing?—Yes, but only to such extent as we have officers in the upper ranks to make supernumerary.

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

July 1875.

3742. Have you any idea what the number of vacancies caused by promotion or retirement in the captains in the course of the year is?—I hand in a return giving the information.

ROYAL ARTILLERY.

RETURN showing the Average Number of Vacancies occurring annually in the rank of Captain under the heads specified below.

By Promotion.	By Death.	By Retirement.	By other Causes.
12*	2	1	2†

Horse Guards, War Office, 1st July 1875.

R. P. RADCLIFFE, D.A.G.

3743. I wish to arrive at an understanding of the block in question, but I see in 1874 17 captains were promoted to be majors, according to the list that we have before us?—Yes.

3744. I presume that must be not a very extraordinary number, because it follows immediately after an enormous number of promotions in 1872?—17 represents a very good rate of promotion in one year, but the number shown in 1872 must not be taken as the proportion for one year, as in that year all the captains were made majors, and it is the alteration to the latter grade that is shown.

3745. Supposing to arrive at something like an average annual rate of promotion we take the number of 17 as the normal number, and allow one or two vacancies by death or retirement. This gives us 20, and if that is fairly correct you will observe that in four years 80 captains will be promoted; that will be in June 1879?—Yes.

3746. And the first commission of that captain will be dated in April 1859?—Yes.

3747. Therefore even in four years the block would not become very terrible?—I cannot conceive that there will be 20 captains promoted annually.

3748. But I am assuming that would be the case, and I am basing my figure of 20 upon the fact that I find that in 1874, 17 captains were promoted to be majors, and I assume that there will be some deaths or other vacancies; probably the promotions in that year may be a false guide?—In 1873 there are only seven.

3749. It is pointed out to me that in 1875 there are 20 up to June?—I have not gone through the figures in that way.

3750. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Does a colonel hold the rank of brigadier-general when he commands a district?—No.

3751. What is the particular reason why it is necessary that he should have the regimental rank of full colonel?—I suppose it is considered that the command of a large force of artillery should not be given to an officer below that rank.

3752. But he would have that rank of full colonel after he had been five years a lieutenant-colonel?—Yes.

3753. Would not an officer of the line who was three months senior as a full colonel command your full colonel?—Yes; he would if he were senior.

3754. Therefore there is no real importance attached to a full colonelcy of the artillery; it gives no rank?—No; as he is generally a brevet full colonel before he is a regimental colonel.

3755. He only takes his rank from his brevet?—That is in the army.

3756. You mentioned a plan of yours to give more promotion to the artillery, that of putting the artillery colonels upon the list with the line?—Yes.

3757. No doubt with the view or the knowledge that the artillery would gain a great many steps to the rank of major-general beyond their quota; that is the idea, I presume?—I have never looked upon it in that light. I thought it would give us a fair chance with the others.

3758. How do you mean, it would give you "a fair chance"?—I presume that you are inferring that the proportion of general officers in the line to the force is smaller than our proportion.

3759. I mean if the artillery colonels were put upon one line with the line colonels and a fixed establishment for the two, you would have a much larger number of general officers than you are or would be entitled to if your number was increased?—We might, or we might not.

3760. (*Chairman.*) Looking to the list of captains I observe that the senior captain entered the army in April 1856?—Yes, that is so.

3761. And that the junior captain entered the army in June 1862?—That is so.

3762. Therefore there is only a difference of six years between the junior and senior captain?—That is so.

3763. Now I see the senior major entered the army in June 1850?—Yes.

3764. And the junior major entered the army in April 1856?—Yes.

3765. So that there is only a difference of six years between the senior and junior majors?—That is so.

3766. I find the senior lieutenant-colonel entered the army in December 1843, and the junior lieutenant-colonel in June 1850, so that there is only a difference of seven years between the senior and junior lieutenant-colonels?—Yes, that is so.

3766*a*. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Will you tell the Committee the emolument of an honorary colonel of the mounted branch of the artillery, and the emolument of a colonel of an ordinary brigade?—The one, I think, is 1,080*l.* a year, and the other, 994*l.*

The witness withdrew.

* The number in this column represents the average ordinary promotion for the past five years, excluding those promotions which took place in September 1871, which were altogether abnormal and will not recur. I refer to the steps caused by the appointment of lieutenant-colonels to the auxiliary forces, and to special retirements under R.W. dated 31st May 1871.

† The vacancies shown in this column have been caused by officers being placed upon temporary half-pay on account of ill health, and who return to the regiment.

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

No. 1.

Royal Artillery.

Return shewing the Present Ages and Service of Officers who entered the Royal Artillery, from 1855 to 1862, now holding the Rank of Major and Captain.

No.	Year of Entry.	Present Age.	Present Service.	No.	Year of Entry.	Present Age.	Present Service.	No.	Year of Entry.	Present Age.	Present Service.	No.	Year of Entry.	Present Age.	Present Service.
		Y. M.	Y. M.			Y. M.	Y. M.			Y. M.	Y. M.			Y. M.	Y. M.
1	1855	37 3	20 4	78	1856	37 5	19 3	154	1858	35 7	16 6	229	1860	34 5	14 7
2	1855	37 10	20 4	79	1856	38 1	19 3	155	1859	34 11	16 3	230	1860	32 11	14 7
3	1855	38 9	20 4	80	1856	35 3	19 0	156	1859	36 8	16 3	231	1860	33 9	14 7
4	1855	38 2	20 4	81	1856	35 4	19 0	157	1859	34 7	16 3	232	1860	32 2	14 7
5	1855	38 4	20 4	82	1856	37 4	19 0	158	1859	34 2	16 3	233	1860	32 6	14 7
6	1855	37 9	20 4	83	1856	35 10	19 0	159	1859	36 2	16 0	234	1860	33 10	14 7
7	1855	37 1	20 4	84	1856	37 1	19 0	160	1859	35 11	16 0	235	1860	34 2	14 7
8	1855	38 5	20 4	85	1856	37 9	19 0	161	1859	36 1	16 0	236	1860	32 10	14 7
9	1855	38 7	20 4	86	1856	36 5	19 0	162	1859	36 8	16 0	237	1860	33 11	14 7
10	1855	37 6	20 4	87	1856	36 8	19 0	163	1859	34 1	16 0	238	1860	33 4	14 7
11	1855	38 3	20 4	88	1856	35 6	19 0	164	1859	34 6	16 0	239	1860	32 10	14 7
12	1855	39 4	20 4	89	1856	41 8	18 11	165	1859	35 5	16 0	240	1860	32 9	14 7
13	1855	37 1	20 2	90	1856	41 8	18 11	166	1859	33 10	16 0	241	1860	33 0	14 7
14	1855	37 3	20 2	91	1856	40 11	18 11	167	1859	34 7	16 0	242	1860	33 3	14 7
15	1855	37 1	20 2	92	1856	40 0	18 11	168	1859	34 11	16 0	243	1860	34 2	14 7
16	1855	37 10	20 2	93	1856	41 5	18 11	169	1859	37 5	16 0	244	1860	33 4	14 7
17	1855	37 6	20 2	94	1856	40 11	18 11	170	1859	34 6	16 0	245	1860	34 3	14 7
18	1855	37 6	20 2	95	1856	40 9	18 11	171	1859	34 5	15 7	246	1861	33 2	14 3
19	1855	36 11	20 2	96	1856	39 9	18 11	172	1859	34 6	15 7	247	1861	32 1	14 3
20	1855	37 6	20 2	97	1856	35 0	18 8	173	1859	35 10	15 7	248	1861	34 2	14 3
21	1855	40 3	19 11	98	1856	36 7	18 7	174	1859	34 7	15 7	249	1861	32 2	14 3
22	1855	39 3	19 11					175	1859	35 4	15 7	250	1861	33 9	14 0
23	1855	39 9	19 11	99	1857	37 5	18 3	176	1859	33 6	15 7	251	1861	32 11	14 0
24	1855	37 6	19 11	100	1857	36 4	18 2	177	1859	35 1	15 7	252	1861	31 6	14 0
25	1855	38 7	19 11	101	1857	35 9	18 2	178	1859	35 9	15 7	253	1861	35 10	14 0
26	1855	39 7	19 11	102	1857	36 0	18 2	179	1859	34 0	15 7	254	1861	33 1	14 0
27	1855	38 8	19 11	103	1857	36 0	18 2	180	1859	35 1	15 7	255	1861	32 3	14 0
28	1855	38 4	19 11	104	1857	35 5	18 2	181	1859	35 6	15 7	256	1861	32 10	14 0
29	1855	37 3	19 11	105	1857	37 1	18 0	182	1859	34 11	15 7	257	1861	33 8	14 0
30	1855	38 9	19 11	106	1857	35 11	18 0	183	1859	35 1	15 7	258	1861	33 5	14 0
31	1855	37 8	19 11	107	1857	36 10	18 0	184	1859	33 7	15 7	259	1861	33 11	14 0
32	1855	37 3	19 11	108	1857	37 0	17 9	185	1859	34 7	15 7				
33	1855	37 4	19 11	109	1857	37 4	17 9	186	1859	36 2	15 7	260	1860	33 5	14 8
34	1855	36 5	19 11	110	1857	37 0	17 9	187	1859	34 0	15 7				
35	1855	37 7	19 11	111	1857	36 2	17 9					261	1861	33 8	14 0
36	1855	38 6	19 11	112	1857	34 5	17 9	188	1860	35 2	15 0				
37	1855	37 6	19 11	113	1857	35 5	17 9	189	1860	34 10	15 0	262	1859	33 9	15 7
38	1855	39 3	19 9	114	1857	36 10	17 9	190	1860	34 4	15 0				
39	1855	40 7	19 9	115	1857	33 11	17 9	191	1860	34 11	15 0	263	1861	32 6	14 0
40	1855	40 9	19 9	116	1857	37 3	18 7	192	1860	34 5	15 0	264	1861	35 6	13 9
41	1855	39 6	19 9	117	1857	36 1	17 9	193	1860	33 11	15 0	265	1861	33 6	13 9
42	1855	40 11	19 9	118	1857	36 6	17 9	194	1860	35 0	15 0	266	1861	33 7	13 7
43	1855	39 6	19 9	119	1857	36 3	17 9	195	1860	36 5	15 0	267	1861	35 7	13 7
44	1855	40 1	19 9	120	1857	35 2	17 9	196	1860	35 0	15 0	268	1861	32 5	13 7
45	1855	40 1	19 9	121	1857	37 0	17 9					269	1861	34 9	13 7
46	1855	39 3	19 9	122	1857	35 4	18 0	197	1857	33 9	17 9	270	1861	33 3	13 7
47	1855	38 1	19 9	123	1857	37 10	17 9					271	1861	32 0	13 7
48	1855	37 0	19 19	124	1857	38 0	17 9	198	1860	36 3	15 0	272	1861	32 4	13 7
49	1855	37 10	19 9	125	1857	36 7	17 9	199	1860	35 5	15 0	273	1861	32 10	13 7
50	1855	37 9	19 9	126	1857	36 11	17 9	200	1860	33 1	15 0	274	1861	32 5	13 7
51	1855	37 9	19 7	127	1857	38 3	17 9	201	1860	35 1	15 0	275	1861	33 7	13 7
52	1855	37 10	19 7	128	1857	36 8	17 9	202	1860	35 5	15 0	276	1861	33 4	13 7
53	1855	36 5	19 7	129	1857	34 11	17 9	203	1860	35 9	15 0	277	1861	31 7	13 7
54	1855	37 0	19 7	130	1857	35 2	17 9	204	1860	34 8	15 0	278	1861	31 7	13 7
55	1855	37 5	19 7	131	1857	36 1	17 9	205	1860	34 1	15 0	279	1861	33 4	13 7
				132	1857	36 6	17 9	206	1860	33 11	15 0	280	1861	31 7	13 7
56	1856	40 10	19 4	133	1857	35 1	17 9	207	1860	35 8	15 0	281	1861	32 4	13 7
57	1856	41 2	19 4	134	1857	36 2	17 9	208	1860	36 0	15 0	282	1861	32 3	13 7
58	1856	40 3	19 4	135	1857	35 8	17 9	209	1860	33 3	15 0	283	1861	34 1	13 7
59	1856	41 5	19 4	136	1857	36 1	17 9	210	1860	33 7	15 0	284	1861	32 6	13 7
60	1856	39 7	19 4	137	1857	36 3	17 6	211	1860	33 8	15 0	285	1861	32 3	13 7
61	1856	41 3	19 4	138	1857	35 5	17 6	212	1860	33 9	15 0	286	1861	33 1	13 7
62	1856	41 2	19 4	139	1857	34 8	17 6	213	1860	33 11	14 8	287	1861	33 4	13 7
63	1856	40 9	19 4	140	1857	35 4	17 6	214	1860	34 1	14 8	288	1861	32 9	13 7
64	1856	40 0	19 4	141	1857	34 11	17 6	215	1860	36 4	14 8	289	1861	32 11	13 7
65	1856	38 11	19 3					216	1860	35 0	14 8	290	1861	34 8	13 7
66	1856	39 0	19 3	142	1858	33 7	17 0	217	1860	33 7	14 8				
67	1856	38 7	19 3	143	1858	32 10	17 0	218	1860	32 7	14 8	291	1862	33 1	13 0
68	1856	37 10	19 3	144	1858	34 3	17 0	219	1860	35 6	14 8	292	1862	35 5	13 0
69	1856	38 5	19 3	145	1858	34 5	17 0	220	1860	32 9	14 8	293	1862	34 0	13 0
70	1856	37 6	19 3	146	1858	34 6	17 0	221	1860	33 2	14 8	294	1862	30 8	13 0
71	1856	38 5	19 3	147	1858	34 3	17 0	222	1860	32 10	14 8	295	1862	34 11	13 0
72	1856	36 11	19 3	148	1858	34 8	17 0	223	1860	35 4	14 8	296	1862	33 1	13 0
73	1856	37 1	19 3	149	1858	33 9	17 0	224	1860	35 3	14 8	297	1862	33 4	13 0
74	1856	37 4	19 3	150	1858	34 8	16 9	225	1860	32 11	14 8	298	1862	34 5	13 0
75	1856	37 7	19 3	151	1858	34 2	16 9	226	1860	32 8	14 8	299	1862	34 7	13 0
76	1856	37 5	19 3	152	1858	34 3	16 9	227	1860	33 10	15 0	300	1862	33 10	13 0
77	1855	37 1	19 3	153	1858	35 5	16 9	228	1860	33 3	14 8	301	1862	34 5	13 0

Col. R. P. Radcliffe.

5 July 1875.

Below are the number of cadets who entered the Royal Artillery during the years specified, and the enclosed return shows the ages and services of those now remaining in the Service.

	Entered.	Now serving.
1855 -	91	55
1856 -	73	44
1857 -	73	43
1858 -	23	13
1859 -	63	33
1860 -	81	58
1861 -	72	43
1862 -	35	29*
	511	318

* Of whom 11 only are captains, and whose age and service are described in the subjoined return.

R. P. Radcliffe,
D.A.G., R.A.

No. 2.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Number of Regimental Colonels employed, and the Number which must necessarily remain unemployed for want of Commands, &c. requiring an Artillery Officer of that Rank.

—	No. now employed in Regimental Command.	On Staff.	In the Manufacturing Departments, &c.	No. unemployed.	Total.
At home -	7	4	5	10	26
Abroad -	10	2	—	—	12

Horse Guards, War Office, 1st July 1875.

R. P. Radcliffe, D.A.G.

No. 3.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Number of actual Steps annually in each Rank during the last Five Years.

Ranks.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Colonels commandant -	—	2	1	1	—
Major-generals unattached.	2	2	2	1	—
Colonels - -	5	6	4	4	8
Lieutenant-colonels -	8	20*	8	5	12
First Captains and Majors	6	43†	16	7	19
Second Captains and Captains.	4	48† §	40‡	20	32

* Ten lieut.-colonels for auxiliary forces granted.
† Retirements by special annuity.
‡ Captains holding staff employment made supernumerary.
§ In 1871 there was also an increase to the horse and field artillery at home, which added to the number of promotions in that year.

R. P. Radcliffe,
Horse Guards, War Office, D.A.G., R.A.
1st July 1875.

No. 4.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Number of Officers in each Rank.

Rank.	Effectives.	Supernumreary.
Colonels commandant -	17	—
Major-generals unattached -	15	—
Colonels - - -	34	4
Lieutenant-colonels -	71	19
Majors - - -	138	29
Captains - - -	169	58
Subalterns - - -	379	12
	823	122
	945	

R. P. Radcliffe,
Horse Guards, War Office, D.A.G., R.A.
1st July 1875,

No. 5.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Age and Service of the Senior and Junior in each Rank of the Old List.

—	Age. Y.	M.	Service. Y.	M.	—
Colonel-Commandant:					
Senior - -	87	4	71	8	} 17
Junior - -	64	8	47	2	
General Officer, Unattached:					
Senior - -	57	8	39	7	} 15
Junior - -	58	7	40	8	
Colonel:					
Senior - -	59	1	40	8	} 36
Junior - -	50	2	31	8	
Lieutenant-Colonel:					
Senior - -	49	2	31	8	} 90
Junior - -	43	2	25	1	
Major:					
Senior - -	42	9	25	1	} 167
Junior - -	37	8	19	3	
Captain:					
Senior - -	57	5	19	2	} 227
Junior - -	34	7	13	0	
					391 subalterns.

Horse Guards, War Office, 1st July 1875.

R. P. Radcliffe, D.A.G., R.A.

No. 6.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Average Number of Years in obtaining Promotion in each Rank.

Rank.	1870. Y.	M.	1871. Y.	M.	1872. Y.	M.	1873. Y.	M.	1874. Y.	M.
Regimentl Colonel to Colonel Commandant.	—		14	7	14	5	14	9	—	
Brevet Colonel to Major General.	12	3	13	6	14	2	14	7	—	
Lieut.-Colonel to Colonel.	8	2	8	5	8	3	9	2	9	7
Captains and Majors to Lieut.-Colonel.	11	11	11	9	11	8	11	9	11	9
Second Captain to First Captain and Major.	10	3	10	3	8	8	9	2	9	3
Lieutenant to Second Captain and Captain.	12	7	13	5	12	6	12	8	13	4

Horse Guards, War Office, 1st July 1875.

R. P. Radcliffe, D.A.G., R.A.

No. 7.

Royal Artillery.

Return showing the Number of Captains, Second Captains, and Lieutenants who applied to retire under the provisions of Royal Warrant of 31st May 1871, upon special Annuities.

—	Captains.	Second Captains.	Lieutenants.
Number applied to retire -	16	13	14
Number retired - -	13	11	13

Horse Guards, War Office, 12th July 1875.

R. P. Radcliffe, D.A.G., R.A.

Colonel JAMES FRANKFORT MANNERS BROWNE, C.B., R.E., examined.

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

3767. (*Chairman.*) You are I believe, the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Royal Engineers?—I am.

3768. We wish to have the benefit of your advice and experience with reference to the present system of promotion and retirement which prevails in the engineers. What are the terms of retirement beginning with the captain's rank which are open to the engineers at present?—I would begin at the top if you will allow me. Our officers are graded in ranks as in the Royal Artillery. A system of retirement was established in 1854, which was modified by the late warrant of 1872. The original system of 1854 I will explain first, and then point out the modifications afterwards. The warrant of 1854 gave to general officers and regimental colonels who had served for 30 years 600*l.* a year; to lieutenant-colonels with the brevet rank of colonel and 30 years' service 400*l.* a year.

3769. (*Lord Hampton.*) Upon retirement?—Upon voluntary retirement. To all officers after 30 years' service 20*s.* a day, which would be 365*l.* a year.

3770. (*Chairman.*) Was that confined to no particular rank?—All officers in the army are entitled to retire upon 30 years' service when money is available.

3771. But you mentioned the amount they were to receive?—I assume them to be lieutenant-colonels, which they probably would be, but in the warrant I do not think it is limited to lieutenant-colonels. Then there was 365*l.* a year to lieutenant-colonels of less than 30 years' service by medical board; these pensions came out of our fixed annual sum for full-pay retirement voted each year, which was also charged with certain pensions granted between 1840 and 1854.

3772. What was the sum?—It was 16,000*l.* Now it has been increased to 21,500*l.*

3773. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) When was that system introduced?—1854.

3774. Was that also in existence in the artillery?—Yes. All those officers taking full pay got a step of honorary rank upon retirement. That system went on until Lord Cardwell's warrant of 1872. Lord Cardwell limited 600*l.* a year for officers with 40 years' service, whether colonels or general officers, reserving certain vested interests.

3775. (*Chairman.*) That is the same as the artillery?—Yes. Then as regards vested interests, Lord Cardwell allowed the 600*l.* a year to go to all generals and colonels who had completed their qualifying service upon the date of the warrant the 5th of July, the qualifying service being to hold the rank of a general officer or a regimental colonel, with 30 years' service. Men who derived any financial advantage from the warrant—and those advantages were to be calculated by actuaries—were to have their 600*l.* taxed, according to the financial advantage they derived under the provisional arrangement 12th clause of warrant. The vested interest in the 400*l.* pension and the 365*l.* by medical board ceased.

3776. Their pecuniary position was estimated?—Yes. For example if a man got 50*l.* by being promoted a little sooner, that was deducted from the capital of his annuity, or from his pension by an actuarial calculation.

3777. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Were they all subject to that?—All who had not qualified on the day of the warrant; the object I believe was to reduce the retirement to full pay. Therefore an officer having a large pecuniary advantage by the warrant would soon come to full-pay pension. For instance, majors would never get anything but full-pay pension, as they would have got a large financial advantage by the time they might have been entitled to get 600*l.* pension. Again, the junior lieutenant-colonels, one to each battalion, formerly got only major's pay. Lord Cardwell put them on lieutenant-colonel's pay, which was a financial advantage to them. I have up to this been dealing with the 600*l.* Then the 400*l.* that I have already spoken of as given to lieutenant-colonels and brevet colonels is no longer given. The 365*l.* to officers of 30 years' service would be given. We have not had a case of that yet, but I believe the general army rule would be carried out. A clause in the warrant says that the full pay retirement for a lieutenant-colonel is 20*s.* a day. The next retirement, namely 365*l.* by a medical board, has gone. Then we have the half-pay to every officer after 25 years' service, but that does not come out of this vote, it is out of the general army vote.

3778. (*Chairman.*) Let me see by way of recapitulation if I understand the present system. The present system is that after 25 years any officer is entitled to go on half-pay?—Yes.

3779. After 30 years' service any officer is entitled to claim, if there is money enough to grant it him, full-pay retirement of the rank that he holds?—Yes.

3780. Then also after 30 years' service, colonels are entitled to retire upon 600*l. minus* certain deductions, which are calculated upon their pay and their financial position as it was before Lord Cardwell's changes, and it was affected by those changes?—Yes, except those who had qualified for the full 600*l.* referred to before.

3781. Then besides that there is the 600*l.* at 40 years to generals and regimental colonels?—Yes.

3782. How far are those last two retirements of 600*l.* a year dependent upon the amount of 16,000*l.* or 21,000 a year?—The 40 years is independent of it; all the others I have mentioned are dependent upon it, except the half-pay.

3783. The first question I wish to ask you with respect to the present system which you have just described is, to what extent are those retirements of 600*l.* a year at present taken by those who would be entitled to claim them; are they generally taken, or not?—I have here a statement which will shew that at the present time out of the fund applicable to these 600*l.* a year pensions, there is nearly 3,000*l.* which has not yet been claimed.

3784. As a general rule, are those retirements taken as soon as they are available?—No, not of late years; not since 1864 I may say. They have not been popular since 1864, but particularly bad of late, with the exception of the year 1873. (*The witness here handed in the statements marked* "A" and "B.")

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

Statement A.

Statement shewing the amount of the Retired Full Pay Vote for the Royal Engineers, the amount expended, amount available for retirements but not taken, and the balance actually returned to Treasury at the end of each financial year from 1854.

Horse Guards, War Office,
30th June 1875.

1. Year.	2. Amount voted.	3. Amount actually paid in Pensions.	4. Amount retained for Pensions of Officers in Civil employ. See Note I.	5. Amount available for Retirement, not taken, but returned to Treasury.	6. Gross Amount returned to Treasury, being totals of Columns 4 & 5.	Remarks.
	£	£	£	£	£	
1854–5	16,000	6,435	623	8,942	9,565	Officers in Civil employ— Colonel Jebb - - 330*l.* „ Dawson - 293*l.* } 623*l.*
1855–6	16,000	11,564	623	3,813	4,436	
1856–7	16,000	14,216	623	1,161	1,784	
1857–8	16,000	15,172	623	205	828	
1858–9	16,000	15,217	783	—	783	(1.) Colonels Wortham and Larcom elected to retire this year, but there not being a sufficient amount available to provide for their pensions, funds were to accumulate till the necessary amount could be retained, viz.:— Colonel Wortham - 600*l.* „ Larcom - 330*l.* 1,553*l.* total required.
1859–60	16,000	15,079	921	—	921	—
1860–1	16,000	15,079	921		921	(2.) Colonel Dawson died this year, making total amount required to be retained for two out of three, 930*l.*
1861–2	16,000	15,079	921	—	921	—
1862–3	16,000	14,911	930 (See Note II.)	159	1,089	—
1863–4	16,000	15,043	930	27	957	(3.) Colonel Jebb died this year, 930*l.* still required, there being only two retired officers on Civil employ.
1864–5	16,000	14,950	930	120	1,050	—
1865–6	16,000	14,694	930	376	1,306	—
1866–7	16,000	14,951	930	119	1,049	—
1867–8	18,285	15,877	930	1,478	2,408	—
1868–9	18,285	16,407	848	1,030	1,878	(4.) Colonel Larcom left Civil employ and drew pension from Civil funds from 1st January 1869.
1869–70	18,285	16,611	1,000	674	1,674	(5.) Colonel Ord became entitled to full-pay retirement at 400*l.* in April 1869.
1870–1	18,285	16,162	1,000	1,123	2,123	—
1871–2	18,285	15,288	1,000	1,997	2,997	—
1872–3	21,500	15,265	1,000	5,235	6,235	—
1873–4	21,500	17,233	836	3,431	4,267	(6.) Colonel Ord left Civil employ and drew retired full pay from 3rd November 1873.
1874–5	21,500	18,209	300	2,991	3,291	(7.) General Wortham left Civil employ and drew retired full pay from 1st October 1874.

I. Column 4. These amounts were retained under Treasury Regulations for such officers of the corps in Civil employ as had established their right to retire on full pay; as their pensions, in case of their resignation of their Civil employment, would have to be provided out of the amount voted by Parliament for the full-pay retirement of the corps as shown in Column 1.

I. In this year formal sanction was given by the Treasury that only two pensions need be retained for every three officers in Civil employ.

B.

STATEMENT of Retirements on Full Pay in Royal Engineers for the last 10 years.

Horse Guards, War Office,
30th June 1875.

Year.	Nos. Retiring.	Amount each. £ s. d.	Rank and Names.	Remarks.
1865	1	365 0 0	Lt.-Colonel Grattan.	
1866	2	600 0 0	Colonel Moody.	
			„ Yorke.	
1867	4	600 0 0	„ Burgman.	
			„ Mould.	
			„ Ford.	
			„ Beatty.	
	1	365 0 0	Lt.-Col. J. W. Gosset.	
1868	3	600 0 0	Colonel Skyring.	
			„ McCausland.	
			„ Robertson.	
	1	365 0 0	Lt.-Col. Stace.	
1869	1	600 0 0	Colonel Beatson.	
	1	400 0 0	Bt. Col. Ord.	
	1	365 0 0	Lt.-Col. Grain.	
1870	1	600 0 0	Maj. Gen. Denison.	
1871	3	600 0 0	Colonel Whitingham.	
			„ White.	
			„ J. H. Freeth.	
	1	400 0 0	Bt. Col. Scott.	
	1	343 14 2	Lt.-Col. Wilson.	
1872	2	600 0 0	Colonel Hamley.	
			„ S. Freeth.	
1873	2	600 0 0	Maj.-Gen. Bent.	1873 an exceptional year.
			Colonel Collinson.	
	1	599 0 0	„ W. D. Gosset.	
	1	598 0 0	„ J. R. Mann.	
	1	597 0 0	Maj.-Gen. Bourchier.	
	1	584 0 0	Colonel Synge.	
	1	365 0 0	Lt.-Col. Rich.	
1874	1	600 0 0	Colonel G. F. Mann.	
1875	1	594 0 0	„ Mairis.	

3785. Knowing the circumstances of the officers, and the way in which these things work, can you give a reason why that should be so? First of all I would ask you, does the pension present a desirable contrast with the pay and position of the man to whom it is offered?—No. Although we consider the pension a fair pension, it does not present a great attraction, because when officers get to the high rank in which they are eligible for these pensions they are generally well employed and get better pay; their pay, &c. comes to close upon 1,000*l.* a year.

3786. Are you now speaking of regimental colonels?—I am speaking of regimental colonels doing ordinary command duty at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Dover, and other places.

3787. Their emoluments in that point of view would be represented by something like 1,000*l.* a year, and to give them an annuity of 600*l.* a year would be to take 400*l.* from them?—Yes, it is very seldom taken except for particular reasons, such as a man being ordered on foreign service, or being promoted to the rank of major-general and getting no further corps employment, or from ill health.

3788. That has not produced any considerable stagnation, has it, in the general flow of promotion in the engineers?—It has.

3789. Have you any calculation which will enable you to tell the Commission after how many years' service a man upon the average now becomes a major?—He now becomes a major in 18 years.

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

3790. That is a fair rate of promotion, is it not?—As we stand now, with the exception of the subalterns, every rank is in a fair state of promotion.

3791. You say with the exception of the subalterns, why is that?—Because they are over 13 years' service, and we consider 12 years a fair rate.

3792. What your particular branch of the service wants is some method of opening the ranks of the subalterns?—At the present time that is what we want. We have not anything to complain of in the upper ranks. We have had different ways of getting promotion, and we have got it pretty well in the upper ranks; but the great difficulty will arise from the great batches which have entered the corps from Royal Military Academy Woolwich.

3793. Will you explain what you mean by taking large batches?—Issuing a large number of commissions as lieutenants of same date.

3794. Or augmentations?—Yes, and to supply casualties, &c.

3795. I suppose men who have had the training of engineers would have no difficulty in finding civil employment if they left the corps when they were full of life and energy?—I think not.

3796. Therefore possibly if some reasonable inducement were offered to some of those subalterns to retire they would do so?—That was tried with the artillery; in 1871 a grant of 5,000*l.* was apportioned upon a scale coming down to the subalterns at a very low rate.

3797. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) I believe that was tried without success?—No; it was tried with success I am informed as far as getting rid of the officers went, but some of them are most anxious to get back again being in poverty.

3798. (*Chairman.*) I do not understand how that was done?—I produce the warrant of 31st May 1871 referring to it.

3799. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Was that consequent upon Mr. Vivian's committee?—I presume it was consequent upon Mr. Vivian's committee.

3800. (*Chairman.*) Here is the warrant of the 31st of May 1871 under which it is declared that a limited number of officers of the rank of captain, second captain, or lieutenant in the royal artillery shall be permitted, until our further pleasure in this matter shall be known, to retire permanently upon annuities upon the following scale. After 22 years service 225*l.* a year, and then a graduated scale going down to eight years service, the annuity of eight years service being 51*l.* a year?—Yes.

3801. You say these retirements provided for in this warrant were taken?—They were altogether taken, and I was told by the late deputy adjutant-general of the artillery that they acted satisfactorily; it resulted in breaking up the batches to a certain extent.

3802. Would some system of that sort be applicable, not merely as a temporary measure, but as a permanent measure to your corps, so that there should be a greater number of retirements amongst your younger officers?—Yes, I think it would be a good thing to try the experiment as with the artillery; this was a temporary thing with the artillery. When these men die, their money falls to the country; it does not go to the artillery again.

3803. But you have no definite opinion that it would not be a good arrangement as a permanent arrangement?—I should not like to see it established as a permanent thing. I think it would create an ill feeling in the line.

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

3804. But supposing there was something equivalent for the line?—Then it might apply to us too.

3805. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Have you any other objection but that it might create ill feeling if applied to the Royal Engineers alone?—I have the objection that we should lose a great many good and efficient officers. I am certain of that.

3806. (*Chairman.*) So the army did under purchase, which was just the same thing?—Yes, if men chose to sell out, but they did not cost the country the sum of money to train that the officers of Royal Engineers do.

3807. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) But for every man that you lose you get an equally well-trained man coming afterwards?—Yes, you get him afterwards, but he is two years and a half at Chatham, and he is no use to the regiment during that time. I believe in the artillery a good many inefficient men took it, that is to say, men who thought they had no chance of getting on in the service; and I believe if it was offered to us a certain number of inefficient men would take it too.

3808. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You mean men whose prospects were less brilliant than those of others?—Yes.

3809. (*Chairman.*) When you say less brilliant, are not the promotions by seniority?—Yes, promotions are by seniority, but employment is by selection. You would not select an inefficient man for a staff appointment. We look upon all commands as appointments, and there are some of us selected for civil employments; in fact nearly everything from the top to the bottom is selection, except the actual regimental promotions I mean to convey the impression that even for the ordinary duties of the corps men are selected according to their known qualifications.

3810. If it is the case that the engineers offer so many appointments that a man's progress is, as it were, more determinable by selection than by mere seniority, it would seem to follow that a system of voluntary retirements offered to the younger men would not be so dangerous amongst the engineers as it would be amongst the line, where selection affects a man's position but little, as it would address itself particularly to those who saw the least chance of advancement?—That is the argument in its favour. We should lose some efficient men, that is to say, efficient men have told me they would retire, but it might be a different thing when it came to the point.

3811. Still the tendency would be undoubtedly for the retirements to be taken by those who saw a less prospect by remaining on?—Yes.

3812. Can you tell us at all the amount of money which has been returned to the Treasury during the last five years from the sum set apart for the purpose of retirement?—The amount returned to the Treasury in the last five years would be about 14,000*l.*

3813. These figures represent the surplus remaining in hand in each year?—Yes; it is rather a complicated matter to ascertain how that amount is got at, because although we had some money in our hands we could not use it, it was kept for retired officers doing civil duty, in case they should ask for it at any minute, and therefore I have not taken credit for it in my statement of 14,000*l.*

3814. (*Mr. Welby.*) It is not altogether that the officers have not taken advantage of it. It is that you have had certain purposes for its expenditure?—They have not taken advantage of the money really available for distribution.

3815. Is that the gross amount which you return to the Treasury?—No, the gross amount returned to the Treasury in 5 years was 18,913*l.*

3816. Therefore in that is included a certain amount of suspended pensions, is there not?—Yes, in the 18,913*l.*

3817. (*Chairman.*) Does the sum you have set down opposite to each year, in col. 5, represent the actual amount of money which was returned to the Treasury in that year?—No; I must put in the additional sum which was retained for officers in civil employment, as shown in col 4.

3818. Will you tell the Commission what it does represent. Take the present year, 2,991*l.*, what does that represent?—This was a portion of the sum returned into the Treasury.

3819. Take the year before that, 3,431*l.*, did you return that to the Treasury?—We did.

3820. It does represent what you actually returned?—It does represent what we actually returned, but to it must be added the amount retained for officers in civil employ, the gross sum returned was 4,267*l.*

3821. Now as I understand there were certain sums in that year which you could not deal with because there were individuals who might claim?—Yes, to the extent of nearly 900*l.*)

3822. (*Maj.-Gen. Foster.*) Do I understand that there is a larger sum than the 14,000*l.* which eventually will go to the Treasury?—Yes.

3823. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Would you have had any difficulty in making use of that sum had it been in your power to offer it to officers of lower rank than lieutenant-colonels?—I should most likely have expended the whole of it.

3824. That would of course depend upon the terms you offered?—Yes, say upon the terms suggested by Mr. Childers in the report of his Committee.

3825. (*Chairman.*) As I understand your evidence upon the whole, speaking generally of the state of promotion, you are well satisfied with the state of things, except as regards the subalterns?—As we stand at the present moment, but we must look forward, and the look forward is very dark indeed.

3826. What do you apprehend in the future?—I have a return here of the age and the service of the whole corps, and some very curious things will appear from it. For instance, if we will take the majors. Major Malcolm is 37 years and seven months old. Go down 98 steps in the corps to Captain Pole, who is actually two months older. Now take Major Marindin, 37 years and one month old. Captain Sturt 60 places below him is one year and seven months older. Our youngest major is Sanford, 35 years of age, and our youngest captain is Ramsay, 31 years, showing that there are four years between them in age, and 133 places on the list. That shows that the ages of the officers approximate so nearly that in the course of time promotion will be very slow indeed. (*See statement printed at the close of the witness's evidence.*)

3827. Can you tell the Commision the respective number of years service of the senior captain and the junior captain?—The army list will show that the senior captain's first commission dates from the 15th of May 1857, and the junior captain's dates from the 25th of June 1862.

3828. Therefore there is only five years difference between the senior and the junior?—That is all.

3829. Now with regard to the majors, the senior Major has 25 years' service?—Yes.

3830. And the junior major?—The junior major has 18 years service.

3831. There is a difference of seven years between the two?—Yes.

3832. The senior lieutenant-colonel has how much?—Colonel Wray is the senior on the effective list and he has 32 years' service.

3833. And the junior?—He has 25½ years.

3834. That is a difference of 6½ years?—Yes.

3835. Will you now turn to the subalterns. Will you let us have the senior lieutenant and the junior lieutenant?—June 1862 is the date of the senior lieutenant and the junior lieutenant was appointed

February 1875, the senior having 12 years and 8 months' service over the junior.

3836. Now will you give us the average number of yearly vacancies occuring in each rank?—Upon the whole of the 17 battalions, that includes India and all—of course the lieutenants are all imperial,—for five years it has been at the rate of 13 captains in a year.

3837. Are you referring to vacancies from all causes in the captains' rank?—Those are lieutenants promoted to captains.

3838. Then they are vacancies in the captain's rank?—Yes 13 per annum; in the majors' rank 10, in the lieutenant-colonels' rank 9, and in the colonels' rank 6; that is the annual average.

3839. Taken over how many years?—Five years.

3840. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Those are inclusive of the Indian battalions, are they not?—Yes.

3841. (*Lord Hampton.*) You mean Royal Engineers on Indian service?—Yes, but belonging to the original Indian cadre as well as Imperials.

3842. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Do you find there is much difference in the average of retirement upon the whole between the Indian and the royal branches of the service?—Yes; very few retirements of late in the Indian cadres owing to the difficulties of the bonus question, now arranged.

3843. (*Chairman.*) Have you any opinion with reference to the present system of separate establishments of general officers for each arm of the service; do you see any objection to the existing system or do you desire to alter it?—The system was instituted in 1854 as it is now; it has worked very well with us upon the whole; it has not worked with the artillery as you have probably heard from the deputy adjutant-general; but as the amalgamated list of colonels stands at present I should be sorry to see our men put upon it, because it appears to me they would never get promotion at all, I allude to the abundance of staff corps colonels. If any steps were taken to make a fairer list, as I might call it, then probably we should be very pleased to be upon it.

3844. Is not the inevitable result of one general list, that if the promotion in one arm of the service happens to be more quick than in the other, in that branch of the service men will rise to become major-generals more quickly than in the other branches?—Certainly, for example, if a large number of majors became lieutenant-colonels by some special corps promotion in one year in course of time these officers would monopolize a large portion of the general officers' list to the exclusion of other branches of the army, always considering the generals' list to consist of a fixed number as it has since 1854.

3845. If that went on, one particular branch of the service would be represented upon the general's list in a much larger proportion than really belonged to it?—Quite so.

3846. The tendency of such a system would be this, that if the rate of promotion varied for different arms of the service, one arm of the service at a particular time might have a greater number of generals upon its fixed establishment than was its fair proportion, so that it would, as General Foster has put it, be receiving a larger share of the general emoluments of the army?—Quite so; as the list is fixed now there can be only a certain number of engineers, but if we were put upon the army list we might have a larger or lesser proportion of generals as it was before 1854. In the old brevet time before 1854 the number of engineers upon the list was irregular, because it depended upon the dates of their commissions as colonels when the periodical brevets took place.

3847. (*Maj-Gen. Foster.*) You would not be prepared to advocate a reversion to the old system which existed before 1854?—I should not object to it if the Indian staff corps was eliminated and an arrangement made to give a colonel a fair chance of promotion. The first colonel of engineers upon the amalgamated list is Nicholson. He stands seventh upon our own list to be a general officer; he is 193rd in the whole Army List, and he has had 37 staff corps men put ahead of him.

3848. Have you reason to think there is much dissatisfaction amongst the cadres of your regiment in regard to supersession amongst each other; has there in fact been much supersession?—The Indians in the upper ranks, colonels and lieutenant-colonels have superseded us, but we do not care about it. I never felt it myself, and I do not think the officers feel aggrieved.

3849. We have heard that it is felt in the sister service. Suppose it had been felt in the Royal Engineers, should you think it could be met at all by a rectification of the dates of commission by ante-dates such as they give the generals?—I do not think it would be worth while.

3850. Do you remember at all the number of colonels upon the list that a colonel of Indian engineers superseded a short time ago; I think it was 300?—I do not remember that circumstance.

3851. You would not care to see an ante-date given to what you call a British engineer officer where he has been superseded by an Indian officer of the rank of major-general?—I do not think I would care to see it, because we seldom rub together, and they are dying out.

3852. But if they were not dying out would you object to it?—I do not care about it. I would rather leave it alone.

3853. You do not care about the evil lasting a short time?—No.

3854. (*Mr. Welby.*) You have given the number of vacancies, as I understand, which have occurred in the last five years?—Yes.

3855. Those are the actual vacancies, are they not; they are not the effect of any actuarial calculations?—Those are the actual vacancies.

3856. If you were to apply the calculations to the actual number of vacancies of course we should get a long way towards the end of the century before the man who was at the bottom came out at the top?—That is the fact, for the reasons given before.

3857. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) Have you an actuarial calculation with reference to the prospects of promotion in your regiment at the present moment?—I have seen one, but I do not pay any attention to it.

3858. (*Mr. Welby.*) A good actuarial calculation is the only thing that can afford you any clear conception of your prospects, is it not?—They have been calculated by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Davy, and you will find their reports and their returns in the reports of Mr. Childers's and Mr. Vivian's committees. Experience tends to show that promotion will be for the future exceedingly slow.

3859. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) You are satisfied with it at present except as regards the subalterns, are you not?—Just at the present moment I think we may be satisfied. Our senior colonel is 58 years of age.

3860. Do you think the present system of retirement will for the future effect that flow of promotion that will be necessary to secure the efficiency of the regiment?—No, it will be altogether insufficient; officers object to retire under the taxing system of late warrant.

3861. (*Mr. Welby.*) The present system is a voluntary system is it not?—The present system is a voluntary system.

3862. (*Lord Hampton.*) Your senior colonel is 58 years of age, I understood you to state?—He is 58 years of age.

3863. Should you wish to impose by rule any limit to the age of the senior officers?—Not if we could

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

persuade them to retire in any other way. The true way to obtain promotion and efficiency in a seniority corps is to induce the senior officers to retire. I am much in favour of a voluntary scheme and should like to try the experiment of offering an increased rate of pension to the seniors, say 700*l.* in place of 600*l.* a year, the option to extend over a limited time, two years, for example.

3864. (*Chairman.*) Who would you offer that to?—To generals and regimental colonels who had qualified to retire under the regulations. I have written a sketch of my proposal. Cancel the pension clauses of the warrant of the 5th of July 1872, and revert to those of the warrant of 1854, but without limit as regards the money in the present instance. As an exceptional measure, and an inducement to retire, give the major-generals and colonels who have qualified, and the colonels who may qualify within a certain fixed period, the option of retiring upon a pension of 700*l.* a year; the latter to get a step of honorary rank when it comes to their turn, which rank to carry pension to widow. Every colonel retiring gets a step of honorary rank now, but it does not give a general's pension to his widow, and for this reason many hesitate to retire. In the Navy a man who retires from the captains' rank, if he is qualified becomes a rear-admiral, and when he dies his widow receives an admiral's pension.

3865. The full rank of general always carries a pension?—Yes, but I would not give them the step of honorary rank when they retired, I would give it when it came to their turn on the list. A man cannot claim as a right that his widow should get a general officer's pension because he elects to retire with honorary rank, but when the proper time came he would have the right to it. Then under the conditions of warrant I would increase the 400*l.* to lieutenant-colonels to 500*l.* I would make provision for officers reported unfit for service by medical board to retire on a permanent pension, provided they had done a fair amount of service. Now another thing that stops our retirement is that we commute our pensions upon one table, and if we go to the Post Office to buy an annuity we are dealt with under another, which is considered unjust. The army commutation table should be rectified, it is not fair that the public should profit at the expense of the officer, which I believe it does now.

3866. You get them upon the 5 per cent. table and buy upon the 4 per cent. table?—Yes; I believe it is table under 4 per cent. It comes to nearly 30 per cent. against the officers I am informed.

3867. (*Mr. Welby.*) If an officer went into the open market to commute his pension he would do it at 4½ per cent., would he not?—An officer is not allowed to go into the open market, if he were I believe he could get considerably better terms for his pension, the government security of it being so good. With a private office he could commute a portion of his pention still retaining an annuity.

3868. If I go and make an arrangement with the insurance office to get the value of my pension, they will not do it under 5 per cent.?—I am unable to answer, but I believe they would be glad to obtain a government annuity at a very reasonable price.

3869. (*Chairman.*) Have you any other suggestion to make to the Commission?—I think a sum of money might be given to break up the large batches among majors, captains, and lieutenants; that is really our present difficulty. Then there is the question of vested interests, but I think if these larger sums were given as an experiment, that they would to a great extent modify vested interests. A man has a vested interest in 600*l.* a year; he has been growing up under it since 1854, and I think if these sums were offered that to a certain extent they would cancel that vested interest.

3870. Your proposals are for voluntary retirement?—Yes.

3871. Therefore you cannot hurt the vested interest by them?—I think not. If you offer a man 700*l.* for his vested interest in 600*l.* he is not hurt by that. By this process the vested interest is met for those officers who qualify so as to obtain the boon, but not to those below them who may not have been qualified on the expiration of the fixed period. I mean that those officers who can take the boon lose their vested interest, but those who cannot take the boon retain their vested interest. I would not ask for the 700*l.* a year to be granted as a permanent thing, but as a temporary expedient, say for two years.

The following tables, "C," "D," and "E," were also handed in by the witness, who then withdrew.

(C.)

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

STATEMENT shewing the Age, Service, &c. of Officer of Royal Engineers (British).

Horse Guards, War Office, 30th June 1875

	Names.	Age on Commission.	Service.	Age.
	GENERAL OFFICERS.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.
	R. J. Stotherd	18 11	59 10	78 9
	H. Servante	20 11	58 11	79 10
	E. Frome	23 4	50 2	73 6
	W. T. Renwick	22 10	49 10	72 8
	Sir F. E. Chapman	19 10	40 1	59 11
	W. E. D. Broughton	23 5	49 9	73 2
	Sir J. L. A. Simmons	16 10	37 7	54 5
	E. W. Durnford	22 11	48 9	71 8
	Sir H. James	23 3	48 9	72 0
10	G. Wynne	22 0	48 10	70 10
	Sir H. D. Harness	23 1	48 1	71 2
	C. E. Ford	17 4	46 2	63 6
	R. G. Hamilton	19 3	43 1	62 4
	W. C. Hadden	19 3	43 1	62 4
	E. Ogle	17 9	41 0	58 9
	J. Cameron	17 8	40 7	58 3
	J. S. Hawkins	18 1	40 7	58 8
	H. W. Montagu	18 6	33 6	52 0
	COLONELS.			
	C. Fanshawe	17 6	40 6	58 0
20	S. Westmacott	19 5	39 0	58 5
	W. C. Menzies	18 7	38 2	56 9
	R. M. Laffan	17 9	38 2	55 11
	Sir A. H. Freeling	17 5	37 6	54 11
	J. Bayly	18 1	36 3	54 4
	Sir W. F. D. Jervois	17 7	36 3	53 10
	T. L. J. Gallwey	17 8	36 3	53 11
	R. Burnaby	17 7	36 3	53 10
	H. Keane	16 9	36 3	53 0
	F. C. Hassard	18 3	35 0	53 3
30	J. W. Lovell	17 8	34 0	51 8
	E. W. Ward	17 10	34 0	51 10
	J. M. Grant	19 8	33 6	53 2
	J. F. M. Browne	18 8	33 6	52 2
	F. M. H. Somerset	18 0	33 6	51 6
	F. R. Chesney	18 2	32 6	50 8
	T. A. L. Murray	17 10	32 6	50 4
	W. L. Morrison	19 1	32 0	51 1
	A. C. Cooke	17 4	32 0	49 4
	T. Inglis	18 9	32 0	50 9
	LIEUT.-COLONELS.			
40	C. S. Hutchinson	17 4	31 6	48 10
	H. Wray	18 0	31 6	49 6
	C. Pasley	19 1	31 6	50 7
	J. Stokes	18 6	31 6	50 0
	Sir A. Clarke	19 11	31 0	50 11
	J. Y. Moggridge	18 1	31 0	49 1
	J. G. Jervois	19 0	30 6	49 6
	J. C. B. De Butts	18 11	30 6	49 5
	G. S. Tilly	19 5	30 6	49 11
	E. Stanton	17 10	30 6	48 4
50	R. D. Kerr	20 6	31 0	51 6
	C. C. Chesney	18 9	30 0	48 9
	C. B. Ewart	18 4	30 0	48 4
	C. B. P. N. H. Nugent	20 3	29 6	49 9
	E. Belfield	18 3	29 6	47 9
	Hon. G. Wrottesley	18 6	29 6	48 0
	E. C. A. Gordon	18 7	29 6	48 1
	W. Porter	19 3	29 6	48 9
	J. H. Smith	19 5	29 2	48 7
	A. R. V. Crease	19 0	29 2	48 2
60	E. M. Grain	19 1	29 2	48 3
	P. Ravenhill	18 2	29 2	47 4
	H. T. Siborne	19 10	28 11	48 9
	C. S. Akers	17 11	28 11	46 10
	B. A. Wilkinson	18 9	28 11	47 8
	L. Nicholson	19 6	28 11	48 5
	G. E. L. Walker	17 9	28 11	46 8
	F. E. Cox	18 11	28 11	47 10
	S. B. Farrell	17 0	28 11	45 11
	C. W. Barry	17 9	28 6	46
70	R. Warren	18 6	28 6	47 0
	R. H. Stotherd	18 5	28 2	46 7
	W. H. Noble	18 11	28 2	47 1
	H. Shaw	18 0	28 2	46 2
	G. H. Gordon	18 6	28 2	46 8
	C. J. Fowler	20 7	28 2	48 9
	A. R. Clarke	18 10	27 9	46 7
	R. M. Parsons	18 0	27 9	45 9
	F. Brine	18 3	27 9	46 0
	A. A'C. Fisher	17 9	27 9	45 6
80	Sir H. C. Elphinstone	18 0	27 7	45 7
	C. E. Cumberland	17 10	27 7	45 5
	W. C. Phillpotts	17 11	7 7	45 6

	Names.	Age on Commission.	Service.	Age.
		Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.
	A. B. Fyers	18 5	27 7	46 0
	J. P. Cox	17 6	27 7	45 1
	W. O. Lennox	18 1	27 1	45 2
	A. Leahy	17 10	27 1	44 11
	E. L. Bland	18 6	27 1	45 7
	A. W. Durnford	16 4	27 1	43 5
	D. A. Frazer	19 0	27 1	46 1
90	E. F. Du Cane	18 0	26 7	44 7
	W. Crossman	18 5	26 7	45 0
	W. D. Marsh	18 3	25 7	43 10
	W. J. Stuart	18 8	25 7	44 3
	MAJORS.			
	Sir J. C. Cowell	18 6	25 0	43 6
	R. Hawthorn	17 8	25 0	42 8
	G. Graham	19 0	25 0	44 0
	C. E. Harvey	17 10	24 6	42 4
	R. W. Duff	19 0	24 6	43 6
	G. Philips	17 6	24 6	42 0
100	C. N. Martin	19 0	23 11	42 11
	F. E. Pratt	18 9	23 11	42 8
	J. M. C. Drake	18 0	23 6	41 6
	E. R. James	18 6	23 6	42 0
	F. E. B. Beaumont	18 4	23 0	41 4
	C. G. Gordon	19 0	23 0	42 0
	J. B. Edwards	18 0	22 6	40 6
	J. F. D. Donnelly	19 0	22 0	41 0
	A. De C. Scott	19 4	22 0	41 4
	L. A. Hale	19 6	21 6	41 0
110	H. W. H. D. Dumaresq	18 7	21 6	40 1
	A. R. Lempriere	18 4	21 6	39 10
	P. H. Scratchley	18 8	21 3	39 11
	J. P. Maquay	17 6	20 11	38 5
	R. N. Dawson-Scott	18 6	20 11	39 5
	E. O. Hewett	18 11	20 11	39 10
	F. Mould	18 7	20 11	39 6
	C. P. Carey	19 0	20 11	39 11
	W. B. Gosset	18 2	20 11	39 1
	R. Grant	17 0	20 8	37 8
120	E. H. Steward	19 0	20 8	39 8
	E. D. Malcolm	16 11	20 8	37 7
	A. R. MacDonnell	19 3	20 8	39 11
	C. A. L. de Montmorency	17 7	20 8	38 3
	Hon. W. Le Poer Trench	17 4	20 8	38 0
	F. A. Marindin	16 7	20 6	37 1
	M. J. Wheatley	17 9	20 6	38 3
	E. C. Sim	16 8	20 6	37 2
	W. M. T. Campbell	16 5	20 4	36 9
	R. B. Rimington	18 3	20 4	38 7
130	P. G. L. Smith	16 8	20 4	37 0
	J. M. H. Maitland	17 0	20 2	37 2
	C. E. Webber	16 6	20 2	36 8
	E. R. Festing	15 8	20 2	35 10
	W. A. Frankland	17 6	20 4	37 10
	G. W. Stockley	17 6	20 2	37 8
	J. A. Papillon	18 5	20 2	38 7
	G. D. Pritchard	20 0	19 11	39 11
	E. S. Tyler	17 7	19 11	37 6
	E. T. Brooke	19 7	19 11	39 6
140	R. Harrison	18 0	19 11	37 11
	E. H. Courtney	18 11	19 11	38 10
	R. M. F. Sandford	20 7	19 11	40 6
	R. Bullen	20 9	19 11	40 8
	H. H. Jones	17 0	19 11	36 11
	A. T. Storer	16 11	19 11	36 10
	J. T. Twigge	17 0	19 11	36 11
	R. G. Thorold	17 11	19 11	37 10
	E. Mitchell	16 0	19 11	35 11
	R. M. Smith	20 0	19 9	39 9
150	C. W. Wilson	19 6	19 9	39 3
	W. Newsome	26 0	19 9	45 9
	G. Swetenham	18 4	19 3	37 7
	D. C. Walker	18 2	19 3	37 5
	R. Home	18 3	19 3	37 6
	H. Locock	19 0	19 3	38 3
	F. Hime	19 6	19 3	38 9
	W. Keith	19 6	19 3	38 9
	F. B. Mainguy	16 9	19 0	35 9
	H. F. C. Lewin	17 0	19 0	36 0
160	A. G. Durnford	17 10	19 0	36 10
	M. Lambert	17 10	19 0	36 10
	G. E. L. S. Sanford	16 4	18 8	35 0
	E. F. S. Lloyd	17 6	18 8	36 2
	H. D. Crozier	19 6	18 6	38 0
	H. S. Palmer	18 8	18 6	37 2
	R. Barton	19 7	18 6	38 1

Col. J. F M. Brownè, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

	Names.	Age on Commission.	Service.	Age.
		Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.
	R. O. Jones	19 1	18 6	37 7
	V. G. Clayton	19 6	18 6	38 0
	H. C. Seddon	19 0	18 6	37 6
170	F. W. R. Clements	18 10	18 2	37 0
	CAPTAINS.			
	E. Micklem	16 8	18 2	34 10
	F. T. Warburton	18 2	18 2	36 4
	A. Parnell	16 4	18 2	34 6
	G. Blunt	17 2	18 2	35 4
	C E. Luard	17 7	18 2	35 9
	B. Brine	17 9	18 2	35 11
	J. K. Tisdall	16 6	19 6	36 0
	A. C. Hamilton	16 11	18 0	34 11
	C. Crawford	19 8	17 9	37 5
180	F. A. Mesurier	18 9	17 9	36 6
	C. R. T. Davidson	19 5	17 9	37 2
	B. H. Melville	18 4	17 9	36 1
	C. J. Moysey	17 4	17 9	35 1
	J. A. Millar	20 0	17 9	37 9
	J. R. Hogg	18 11	17 9	36 8
	N. G. Sturt	20 11	17 9	38 8
	T. P. White	20 8	17 9	38 5
	J. C. O'n Ferguson	18 8	17 9	36 5
	G. H. Bolland	19 0	17 9	36 9
190	R. W. Stewart	19 11	17 9	37 8
	W. Salmond	17 0	17 9	34 9
	C. M. Collings	17 5	17 6	34 11
	R. H. Vetch	16 11	17 6	34 5
	C. Warren	17 11	17 6	35 5
	E. N. Peters	17 1	17 6	34 7
	J. H. Crowdy	18 6	17 6	36 0
	H. S. Sitweli	18 6	17 6	36 0
	C. A. Lyon-Campbell	17 0	17 6	34 6
	W. S. Maud	18 7	17 6	36 1
200	G. V. Sivewright	16 4	17 6	33 10
	H. S. Clive	16 11	17 6	34 5
	A. B. Coddington	17 10	17 6	35 4
	H. F. Turner	17 1	17 6	34 7
	W. Innes	17 1	17 0	34 1
	H. Tovey	17 0	17 0	34 0
	R. Athorpe	16 8	17 0	33 8
	J. Fellowes	17 0	17 0	34 0
	R. H. B. Beaumont	16 6	17 0	33 6
	R. H. Williams	17 5	16 9	34 2
210	J. G. S. Davies	17 2	16 9	33 11
	E. D. C. O'Brien	17 6	16 9	34 3
	S. Anderson	19 1	16 6	35 7
	C. Woodward	18 8	16 6	35 2
	R. Y. Armstrong	17 10	16 6	34 4
	R. J. Bond	18 11	16 6	35 5
	A. K. Haslett	19 4	16 6	35 10
	G. E. Grover	18 6	16 6	35 0
	C. H. C. Halkett	20 1	16 6	36 7
	G. H. L. Pole	21 3	16 6	37 9
220	C. Bowen	19 9	16 6	36 3
	W. H. Mulloy	19 11	16 6	36 5
	W. R. Slacke	19 0	16 6	35 6
	E. T. Wynne	21 1	16 6	37 7
	F. G. Oldham	19 4	16 6	35 10
	W. J. Engledue	17 7	17 6	35 1
	H. A. Gun	16 8	16 6	33 2
	J. C. Ardagh	18 0	16 3	34 3
	W. E. Peck	19 0	16 3	35 3
	E. Stephens	18 0	16 3	34 3
230	C. J. Russell	19 0	16 3	35 3
	J. M. Morgan	20 0	16 3	36 3
	A. B. Haig	18 11	16 0	34 11
	H. Cautley	20 5	16 0	36 5
	A. Feathersonhaugh	18 0	16 0	34 0
	J. H. Satterthwaite	20 0	16 0	36 0
	E. M. Lloyd	18 9	16 0	34 9
	J. C. Macpherson	20 0	16 0	36 0
	T. Howard	20 0	16 0	36 0
	F. Bailey	18 11	16 0	34 11
240	H. J. W. Gehle	19 4	15 6	34 10
	C. W. Whinfield	19 7	15 6	35 1
	W. H. Patten	19 2	15 6	34 8
	W. H. Collins	21 4	15 6	36 10
	A. J. Hepper	20 1	15 6	35 7
	R. F. Morris	20 3	15 6	35 9
	G. Harris	20 1	15 6	35 7
	L. J. G. Ferrier	19 2	15 6	34 8
	S. W. Jenner	18 0	15 6	33 6
	H. Robinson	19 3	15 6	34 9
250	A. C. C. Mackenzie	19 5	15 6	34 11
	E. Harvey	20 2	15 6	35 8
	J. D. Bowly	18 11	15 0	33 11
	C. Cunningham	19 1	15 0	34 1
	T. Glancy	20 0	14 8	34 8

	Names.	Age on Commission.	Service.	Age.
		Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.
	A. C. Ward	18 11	14 8	33 7
	A. C. Smith	18 5	14 8	33 1
	J. E. Toller	20 10	14 8	35 6
	A. Hill	18 10	14 6	33 4
	F. W. Nixon	19 4	14 6	33 10
260	K. C. Pye	18 1	14 6	32 7
	R. R. E. Brockman	19 0	14 6	33 6
	A. A. Jopp	18 5	14 6	32 11
	W. A. J. Wallace	18 11	14 6	33 5
	B. Blood	18 6	14 6	33 0
	J. G. Booth	20 3	14 6	34 9
	H. G. Pilleau	18 10	14 6	33 4
	A. G. Begbie	18 9	14 0	32 9
	M. T. Sale	19 11	14 0	33 11
	T. J. Willans	19 2	14 0	33 2
270	W. de W. Abney	17 0	14 0	31 0
	R. A. Livesay	19 7	14 0	33 7
	Sir A. W. Mackworth, Bart.	18 2	14 0	32 2
	F. Firebrace	21 0	13 6	34 6
	A. de V. Brooke	20 2	13 6	33 8
	J. R. M'Cullagh	19 9	13 6	33 3
	M. W. Rogers	19 10	13 6	33 4
	R. A. Sargeaunt	21 0	13 6	34 6
	J. T. Marsh	20 7	13 6	34 1
	R. J. H. Parker	21 0	13 6	34 6
280	H. L. Lewis	19 3	13 6	32 9
	H. Champernowne	21 7	13 6	35 1
	C. S. Beauchamp	19 8	13 6	33 2
	W. Osborn	20 4	13 6	33 10
	L. F. Boileau	19 5	13 6	32 11
	T. B. Blake Savi	20 1	13 6	33 7
	W. Sedgwick	20 3	13 6	33 9
	A. W. Baird	19 7	13 6	33 1
	A. H. Hime	19 4	13 6	32 10
	T. Fraser	21 0	13 0	34 0
290	M. S. Bell	19 0	13 0	32 0
	F. W. Heneage	18 11	13 0	31 11
	W. R. C. Wynne	19 2	13 0	32 2
	W. St. G. Burke	20 3	13 0	33 3
	G. F. O. Boughey	18 5	13 0	31 5
	J. Ramsay	18 0	13 0	31 0
	W. F. Richardson	19 1	13 0	32 1
	G. W. Archer	21 0	13 0	34 0
	LIEUTENANTS.			
	R. G. Scott	19 0	13 0	32 0
	R. T. Frere	18 5	13 0	31 5
300	T. H. Anstey	20 0	13 0	33 0
	J. Hill	21 0	13 0	34 0
	G. T. Punkett	19 10	13 0	32 10
	E. R. Larminie	21 0	13 0	34 0
	L. K. Scott	21 0	13 0	34 0
	T. English	18 9	12 6	31 3
	V. F. Rowe	21 0	12 6	33 6
	W. G. Ross	19 0	12 6	31 6
	T. H. Holdich	19 10	12 6	32 4
	F. S. Shepherd	19 9	12 6	32 3
310	A. B. M'Hardy	20 6	12 6	33 0
	F. H. Fawkes	21 5	12 6	33 11
	T. Gracey	19 0	12 6	31 6
	D. O'Brien	18 6	12 6	31 0
	C. de B. Carey	19 0	12 6	31 6
	B. Lowsley	21 9	13 0	34 9
	W. H. Rathborne	20 11	12 6	33 5
	W. J. Galwey	21 9	12 6	34 3
	W. H. Haydon	18 0	12 6	30 6
	J. G. Hall	20 4	12 6	32 10
320	A. A. W. Beamish	20 1	12 6	32 7
	H. H. Cole	19 0	12 6	31 6
	H. C. Reynolds	21 2	12 6	33 8
	H. P. Knocker	20 1	12 0	32 1
	H. P. Lee	20 0	12 0	32 0
	K. R. Todd	20 1	12 0	32 1
	F. Q. Edmondes	20 8	12 0	32 8
	W. F. H. Spaight	20 8	12 0	32 8
	W. S. S. Bisset	19 6	12 0	31 6
	W. H. Coaker	18 10	12 0	30 10
330	F. I. Edwards	21 2	12 0	33 2
	H. H. Whatley	20 2	11 11	32 1
	H. C. Fox	21 0	11 11	32 11
	F. Mascall	21 7	11 6	33 1
	J. T. Bucknill	20 7	11 6	32 1
	E. Wood	19 8	11 6	31 2
	H. Elsdale	20 11	11 6	32 5
	J. W. Savage	19 3	11 6	30 9
	H. P. Kirkwood	20 0	11 6	31 6
	F. V. Corbett	20 0	11 6	31 6
340	A. G. Clayton	20 5	11 6	31 11
	J. W. Ottley	22 5	11 6	33 11
	S. J. Lambert	21 9	11 6	33 3

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

	Names.	Age on Commission. Y.	M.	Service. Y.	M.	Age. Y.	M.
	M. F. Ommanney	21	9	11	6	33	3
	W. North	21	3	11	5	32	8
	A. D. M'Arthur	19	7	11	5	31	0
	J. L. Macpherson	21	10	11	4	33	2
	H. P. C. Dillon	21	2	11	4	32	6
	W. P. Jones	20	0	11	3	31	3
	R. Calrow	20	8	11	2	31	10
350	J. F. Dorward	20	8	10	11	31	7
	J. Simpson	21	2	10	11	32	1
	C. James	22	11	10	11	33	10
	H. R. G. Georges	19	8	10	10	30	6
	W. L. Greenstreet	20	11	10	8	31	7
	G. Hildebrand	20	0	10	8	30	8
	G. Macdonald	21	4	10	11	32	3
	W. J. Gill	21	2	10	8	31	10
	J. T. Wright	21	0	10	7	31	7
	A. Awdry	20	8	10	7	31	3
360	W. B. Hurst	21	6	10	7	32	1
	S. Waller	20	4	10	7	30	11
	A. C. Alexander	21	0	10	6	31	6
	A. R. Puzey	19	4	10	6	29	10
	J. Matheson	20	11	10	6	31	5
	J. B. Lindsell	20	5	10	6	30	11
	W. G. Nicholson	20	0	10	3	30	3
	R. R. Pulford	19	3	10	3	29	6
	P. S. G. Reid	19	8	10	2	29	10
	P. J. D. Lindoe	20	0	10	2	30	2
370	M. Greer	20	11	10	1	31	0
	E. C. Hart	20	10	10	0	30	10
	E. C. Fanshawe	21	0	10	0	31	0
	M. C. Brackenbury	20	4	10	0	30	4
	R. H. Jelf	21	0	10	0	31	0
	R. G. Woodthorpe	20	9	10	0	30	9
	F. P. Washinghton	22	4	10	0	32	4
	H. S. F. Haynes	19	0	10	0	29	0
	S. L. Jacob	20	0	9	6	29	6
	C. F. C. Beresford	21	7	9	6	31	1
380	J. S. Nicholson	20	4	9	6	29	10
	N. Arnott	21	9	9	6	31	3
	G. R. Walker	22	0	9	6	31	6
	R. C. T. Hildyard	21	1	9	6	30	7
	D. McN. Campbell	19	11	9	6	29	5
	C. C. C. Barlow	20	4	9	6	29	10
	W. R. Purchas	21	11	9	6	31	5
	C. M. Watson	21	8	9	2	30	10
	H. Jekyll	19	5	9	2	28	7
	C. H. P. Christie	20	1	9	2	29	3
390	E. C. S. Moore	21	5	9	2	30	7
	E. P. Leach	19	0	9	2	28	2
	S. C. Turner	20	5	9	2	29	7
	G. J. Gould	21	2	9	2	30	4
	D. C. Courtney	21	3	9	2	30	5
	M. H. Purcell	20	9	9	2	29	11
	J. F. Garwood	20	6	9	2	29	8
	J. E. Broadbent	21	0	8	11	29	11
	J. du T. Bogle	21	0	8	11	29	11
	S. Buckle	20	0	8	11	28	11
400	W. E. L. Morgan	19	7	8	11	28	6
	C. F. Call	21	0	8	11	29	11
	W. J. H. Logan-Home	19	4	8	6	27	10
	W. A. H. Hare	20	1	8	6	28	7
	A. O. Green	19	5	8	6	27	11
	J. F. Lewis	20	8	8	6	29	2
	F. R. de Wolski	21	6	8	0	29	6
	R. M. Barklie	21	6	8	0	29	6
	C. H. M. Kensington	20	4	8	0	28	4
	W. G. Morris	20	5	8	0	28	5
410	H. Denison	20	4	8	0	28	4
	W. H. James	20	0	8	0	28	0
	W. H. Johnstone	20	10	8	0	28	10
	M. H. Gregson	21	6	8	0	29	6
	H. H. Settle	20	5	8	0	28	5
	F. J. Day	21	3	7	6	28	9
	L. F. Brown	19	11	7	6	27	5
	D. A. Johnston	20	7	7	6	28	1
	R. Gardiner	21	1	7	6	28	7
	J. F. Hewson	20	10	7	6	28	4
420	J. Hare	20	9	7	6	28	3
	R. F. Moore	20	1	7	6	27	7
	G. Henry	21	5	7	6	28	11
	C. H. Bagot	20	7	7	6	28	1
	G. S. Clarke	20	0	7	0	27	0
	G. W. Bartram	20	4	7	0	27	4
	J. C. MacGregor	18	7	7	0	25	7
	G. A. Cockburn	20	5	7	0	27	5
	W. W. B. Whiteford	18	9	7	0	25	9
	St. G. M. Kirke	20	11	7	0	27	11
430	H. P. N. Nicholls	19	11	7	0	26	11
	M. G. H. Goldie	19	10	7	0	26	10
	A. W. Smart	19	9	7	0	26	9
	A. Bogle	20	1	7	0	27	1
	A. T. Preston	19	7	7	0	26	7
	C. H. Brookes	19	6	7	0	26	6
	C. C. Rawson	19	6	7	0	26	6
	A. R. F. Dorward	20	0	7	0	27	0
	C. F. Fuller	20	0	7	0	27	0
	J. R. M. Chard	20	7	7	0	27	7
440	R. M. Hyslop	21	1	7	0	28	1
	H. A. Yorke	20	7	6	6	27	1
	G. Barker	19	0	6	6	25	6
	C. H. Gordon	19	7	6	6	26	1
	H. Dove	19	6	6	6	26	0
	S. Smith	21	0	6	6	27	6
	H. Pilkington	19	10	6	6	26	4
	R. C. Hart	20	7	6	6	27	1
	F. W. Watkins	19	7	6	6	26	1
	H. Clarke	20	3	6	6	26	9
450	J. C. Barker	19	6	6	6	26	0
	A. E. O. Cotton	21	2	6	6	27	8
	H. O. Selby	21	1	6	6	27	7
	M. Laugharne	19	8	6	6	26	2
	F. T. N. Spratt	21	3	6	6	27	9
	J. Cameron	20	10	6	6	27	4
	M. D. Whitmore	20	7	6	6	27	1
	C. A. Crompton	19	3	6	6	25	9
	H. J. Harman	19	1	6	0	25	1
	W. W. Robinson	19	10	6	0	25	10
460	W. Peacocke	21	2	6	0	27	2
	A. E. Dobson	20	0	6	0	26	0
	R. T. Orpen	20	4	6	0	26	4
	G. R. R. Savage	20	1	6	0	26	1
	P. Haslett	20	0	6	0	26	0
	T. R. Henn	19	7	6	0	25	7
	G. W. Addison	19	10	6	0	25	10
	A. Porcelli	20	5	6	0	26	5
	F. Gosset	20	9	6	0	26	9
	W. St. G. Ord	20	4	6	0	26	4
470	C. Hoskyns	21	3	6	0	27	3
	F. T. Maxwell	20	5	6	0	26	5
	F. Beauclerk	18	5	6	0	24	5
	M. Martin	20	2	6	0	26	2
	E. R. Hussey	21	0	6	0	27	0
	R. de Villamil	19	11	5	6	25	5
	S. G. C. Gore	20	10	5	6	26	4
	C. H. Johnston	20	11	5	6	26	5
	R. H. Brown	20	11	5	6	26	5
	R. O. Lloyd	20	9	5	6	26	3
480	E. H. Cameron	20	5	5	6	25	11
	C. R. Conder	21	0	5	6	26	6
	H. Mitchell	20	1	5	6	25	7
	H. B. Rich	20	6	5	6	26	0
	W. G. Du Boulay	21	0	5	6	26	6
	D. A. Scott	21	0	5	6	26	6
	W. H. Sykes	21	3	5	6	26	9
	E. W. Creswell	20	2	5	6	25	8
	H. V. Hart-Davis	20	9	5	6	26	3
	H. C. Chermside	19	11	4	11	24	10
490	T. J. Tresidder	20	6	4	11	25	5
	J. E. Gibbs	20	4	4	11	25	3
	T. R. Main	20	4	4	11	25	3
	M. K. Brady	21	4	4	11	26	3
	C. W. Sherrard	21	7	4	11	26	6
	H. W. Renny-Tailyour	20	9	4	11	25	8
	W. Pitt	19	10	4	11	24	9
	C. Wilkinson	20	2	4	11	25	1
	H. H. Hart	19	11	4	11	24	10
	O. V. Boddy	21	1	4	11	26	0
500	J. C. M. Beresford	20	5	4	11	25	4
	C. B. Henderson	20	1	4	11	25	0
	L. Langley	20	2	4	11	25	1
	C. B. Wilkieson	20	2	4	11	25	1
	G. F. Mann	20	1	4	11	25	0
	F. J. Romilly	21	4	4	11	26	3
	J. T. Johnston	20	2	4	11	25	1
	C. C. Carter	19	9	4	11	24	8
	E. Dickinson	21	3	4	11	26	2
	W. F. N. Nowel	20	11	4	11	25	10
510	C. A. Rochfort-Boyd	19	8	4	11	24	7
	H. L. Jessep	20	7	4	11	25	6
	F. B. G. D'Aguilar	21	2	4	7	25	9
	P. Cardew	19	0	4	6	23	6
	L. Darwin	20	0	4	6	24	6
	R. da C. Porter	20	3	4	6	24	9
	M. W. Skinner	21	0	4	6	25	6
	W. T. Shone	20	0	4	6	24	6
	W. H. White	20	0	4	6	24	6
	J. M. T. Badgley	21	0	4	6	25	6
520	H. W. Duperier	19	4	4	6	23	10
	F. W. Bennet	20	0	4	6	24	6
	A. Heathcote	20	0	4	6	24	6
	A. Hildebrand	20	0	4	6	24	6
	R. Thompson	18	6	4	6	23	0

Col. J. F. M. Browne, C.B., R.E.

15 July 1875.

	Names.	Age on Commission.	Service.	Age.
		Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.
	E. J. T. Rossof Bladensburg	21 0	4 6	25 6
	S. M. M'Maycock	19 6	4 6	24 0
	E. J. Dewing	20 0	4 6	24 6
	H. H. Kitchener	20 0	4 6	24 6
	H. G. Kunhardt	20 11	3 11	24 10
530	A. W. Cockburn	20 0	3 11	23 11
	N. M. Lake	18 11	3 11	22 10
	H. L. Wells	21 0	3 11	24 11
	E. Raban	21 0	3 11	24 11
	B. Scott	21 1	3 11	25 0
	G. F. Wilson	20 0	3 11	23 11
	S. Grant	20 0	3 11	23 11
	R. M. Ruck	20 0	3 11	23 11
	S. H. Exham	21 0	3 11	24 11
	E. Glennie	20 0	3 11	23 11
540	H. H. Muirhead	20 0	3 11	23 11
	H. P. Leach	20 3	3 11	24 2
	W. H. Chippindall	21 0	3 11	24 11
	A. C. Bruce	19 8	3 11	23 7
	E. W. Cotter	19 6	3 11	23 5
	F. H. MacDowel	20 0	3 11	23 11
	C. Nugent	21 5	3 11	25 4
	E. J. Bor	20 11	3 11	24 10
	H. E. M'Callum	19 3	3 7	22 10
	J. H. C. Harrison	20 9	3 7	24 4
550	J. Kellie	19 5	3 7	23 0
	J. C. Baxter	20 0	3 7	23 7
	T. P. Cather	21 4	3 7	24 11
	J. T. Rice	19 9	3 7	23 4
	P. G. Von Donop	20 8	3 7	24 3
	W. L. C. Baddeley	21 2	3 7	24 9
	H. D. Olivier	21 2	3 7	24 9
	E. S. Hill	20 8	3 7	24 3
	H. W. Smith	20 1	3 7	24 8
	J. E. Blackburn	20 7	3 7	24 2
560	H. D'A. Breton	20 6	3 7	24 1
	J. H. Fox	21 4	3 7	24 11
	B. Poulter	19 5	3 7	23 0
	H. P. Knight	21 3	3 7	24 10
	W. H. Goldney	21 5	3 7	25 0
	F. S. Leslie	20 2	3 7	23 9
	W. G. Bowyer	21 1	3 7	24 8
	C. L. Young	20 2	3 7	23 9
	J. C. Addison	19 10	3 0	22 10
	J. J. Leverson	19 0	3 0	22 0
570	R. L. Hippisley	19 0	3 0	22 0
	R. C. Hellard	21 0	3 0	24 0
	J. C. L. Campbell	19 0	3 0	22 0
	G. Davidson	21 0	3 0	24 0
	W. J. Lister	19 0	3 0	22 0
	C. K. Wood	21 0	3 0	24 0
	G. H. W. Sullivan	19 0	3 0	22 0
	E. Blunt	20 0	3 0	23 0
	M. N. Hobday	19 10	3 0	22 10
	G. T. Nicholls	20 0	3 0	23 0
580	W. C. Godsal	20 11	2 8	23 7
	R. E. Hamilton	20 0	2 8	22 8
	J. Burn-Murdoch	20 0	2 8	22 8
	C. C. Ellis	20 0	2 8	22 8
	J. B. Sharpe	20 0	2 8	22 8
	T. Digby	21 0	2 8	23 8
	M. C. Barton	20 0	2 8	22 8
	R. C. Maxwell	19 10	2 8	22 6
	A. C. Foley	20 0	2 8	22 8
	D. L. Litton	20 0	2 8	22 8
590	J. Neville	19 0	2 8	21 8
	H. D. Love	20 1	2 4	22 5
	J. W. Sill	20 4	2 4	22 8
	K. Mackean	20 0	2 4	22 4
	A. H. Bagnold	19 0	2 4	21 4
	H. B. Willock	19 0	2 4	21 4
	W. V. Constable	19 6	2 4	21 10
	R. Jennings	20 6	2 4	22 10
	C. H. Darling	20 6	2 4	22 10
	J. Jervois	19 3	2 4	21 7
600	H. E. Rawson	20 0	2 4	22 4
	E. F. Rhodes	20 8	2 4	23 0
	W. J. Mackenzie	19 2	2 4	21 6
	H. S. Andrews-Speed	20 10	2 4	23 2
	P. T. Buston	20 0	2 4	22 4
	J. C. Tyler	18 9	2 4	21 1
	G. H. Sim	20 4	2 4	22 8
	J. C. Campbell	20 0	2 0	22 0
	H. Finnis	20 0	2 0	22 0
	J. A. Ferrier	19 3	2 0	21 3
610	J. D. Fullerton	20 0	2 0	22 0
	C. R. Hoskyn	20 0	2 0	22 0
	E. C. Spilsbury	18 11	2 0	20 11
	P. B. Baldwin	20 0	2 0	22 0
	G. T. Jones	20 0	2 0	22 0
	W. D. Conner	19 0	2 0	21 0
	R. V. Phillpotts	18 3	2 0	20 3
	W. D. Lindley	20 0	2 0	22 0
	E. H. Bethell	19 6	2 0	21 6
	F. W. T. Attree	20 3	2 0	22 3
620	M. H. P. R. Sankey	20 0	1 8	21 8
	Hon. M. G. Talbot	19 0	1 8	20 8
	A. L. Mein	19 0	1 8	20 8
	F. N. Maude	18 0	1 8	19 8
	H. L. Mulholland	19 0	1 8	20 8
	S. A. E. Hickson	20 0	1 8	21 8
	G. C. P. Onslow	20 9	1 8	22 5
	W. F. H. Stafford	18 0	1 8	19 8
	E. A. Waller	19 0	1 8	20 8
	A. H. Kenney	18 9	1 8	20 5
630	R. A. Wahab	18 0	1 8	19 8
	W. A. E. St. Clair	19 0	1 8	20 8
	G. A. Tower	18 0	1 8	19 8
	E. S. E. Childers	19 0	1 8	20 8
	C. V. Wingfield-Stratford	20 0	1 8	21 8
	C. Maxwell	19 0	1 8	20 8
	W. Coles	19 0	1 8	20 8
	L. B. Friend	17 11	1 4	19 3
	G. E. Shute	19 0	1 4	20 4
	F. Rainsford-Hannay	19 6	1 4	20 10
640	H. de H. Haig	18 11	1 4	20 3
	C. Penrose	19 0	1 4	20 4
	J. G. Day	19 0	1 4	20 4
	G. M. Porter	19 0	1 4	20 4
	H. J. W. Jerome	19 0	1 4	20 4
	G. K. Scott Moncrieff	18 0	1 4	19 4
	H. M. Sinclair	19 6	0 11	20 5
	E. R. Kenyon	19 0	0 11	19 11
	S. C. N. Grant	20 0	0 11	20 11
	G. M.'G. Bate	20 0	0 11	20 11
650	M. Elrington	20 2	0 11	21 1
	J. C. Middlemas	19 0	0 11	19 11
	J. Clarke	19 0	0 11	19 11
	F. Peel	18 0	0 11	18 11
	J. G. Lutyens	19 0	0 11	19 11
	M. A. Cameron	19 2	0 4	19 6
	A. E. Wrottesley	19 0	0 4	19 4
	S. D. Cleeve	18 8	0 4	19 0
	A. C. MacDonnell	20 1	0 4	20 5
	E. J. G. Boyce	20 4	0 4	20 8
660	A. H. Mason	18 8	0 4	19 0
	H. Appleton	19 3	0 4	19 7
	J. E. Dickie	18 9	0 4	19 1
	A. R. Ancrum	19 0	0 4	19 4
	H. E. Tyler	19 8	0 4	20 0
665	H. E. S. Abbott	19 10	0 4	20 2

(D.)

RETURN of Casualties in the entire Corps of ROYAL ENGINEERS during the last five years; also the Casualties in the Imperial Cadre, and Promotion in the same exclusive of Augmentation steps.

Horse Guards, War Office, 30th June 1875.

	Number of Casualties in entire Corps.	Number of Casualties in Imperial Corps.	Actual Promotion in Imperial Cadre, Augmentation excluded.	Remarks.
Colonels Commandant	9	6	6	Note.—
Major-Generals	6	3	8	All casualties in Captains of Indian Battalions give promotion to Lieutenants on Imperial List.
Colonels	17	11	22	
Lieutenant-Colonels	10	3	27	
Majors	10	3	25	
Captains	13	9	65	
Lieutenants	32	32	—	
Total	97	67	153	

(E.)

STATEMENT shewing the Number of Officers that have been Commissioned to the ROYAL ENGINEERS since 1833, and the Numbers now serving, with their Rank.

Horse Guards, War Office, 30th June 1875.

Col. J. F. M. Browne C.B., R.E.

5 July 1875.

Year.	Number of First Commissions.	Number still Serving.	Present Rank.
1834	9	3	Major-Generals.
		1	Colonel.
1835	7	1	Lieutenant-General.
1836	5	1	Colonel.
1837	17	1	Lieutenant-General.
		3	Colonels.
1838	6	Nil.	——
1839	16	5	Colonels.
1840	11	1	Colonel.
1841	6	2	Colonels.
1842	11	1	Major-General.
		3	Colonels.
1843	13	5	,,
		4	Lieutenant-Colonels.
1844	11	1	Major-General.
		6	Lieutenant-Colonels.
1845	14	7	,, ,,
1846	24	13	,, ,,
1847	34	14	,, ,,
1848	12	7	,, ,,
1849	4	2	,, ,,
1850	6	6	Majors.
1851	6	4	,,
1852	7	3	,,
1853	11	5	,,
1854	20	16	,,
1855	38	25	,,
1856	22	18	,,
1857	45	1	Major.
		33	Captains.
1858	29	22	,,
1859	32	25	,,
1860	22	15	,,
1861	31	22	,,
1862	40	9	,,
		25	Lieutenants.
1863	12	10	,,
1864	41	33	,,
1865	24	21	,,
1866	16	15	,,
1867	16	13	,,
1868	32	26	,,
1869	40	35	,,
1870	39	38	,,
1871	57	55	,,
1872	24	23	,,
1873	46	46	,,
1874	18	18	,,
1875 ½ year	11	11	,,
Total	885	654	

War Office, Pall Mall, Friday, 23rd July 1875.

PRESENT:

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PENZANCE IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Hon. LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
The Right Hon. EDWARD PLEYDELL BOUVERIE.
Major-General EDWIN BEAUMONT JOHNSON, K.C.B.
Major-General ARTHUR JAMES HERBERT, C.B.
REGINALD EARLE WELBY, Esq., C.B.
Major-General CHARLES JOHN FOSTER.

THOMAS DIGBY PIGOTT, Esq., Secretary.

Field Marshal H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, K.G., examined.

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

23 July 1875.

3872. (*Chairman.*) There are one or two passages, which occur in Lord Sandhurst's evidence which strike this Commission as somewhat remarkable, and we should like to know from your Royal Highness how far these answers are well justified. I will read them:

"(Q.) From your experience of the officers who were under your command, should you have been able in ordinary circumstances to have picked out the man that you would particularly wish to promote?—(A.) I commanded a regiment under the old régime, under which it did not matter how incompetent or how incapable an officer was (he might have been a madman or he might have been an idiot), you were not allowed to get rid of him. (Q.) That is exclusion rather than selection?—(A.) But he was promoted also under the same circumstances; nothing could stop that man's promotion if he remained in the regiment, and practically his promotion never was interfered with. (Q.) There were instances, were there not, even under the old system, of officers not being allowed to go up in their step because they were notoriously unfit?—(A.) I cannot call an instance to mind in all my recollection. I can only say this, that for two or three years when I was a lieutenant-colonel I had two men in my regiment who were lieutenants; one was a madman and another was an idiot, and every six months I reported those men in those terms, or words to that effect; I illustrated it as strongly as I can by saying, 'I dare not give those men charge of a picket, I am obliged to throw their duty upon others, because the responsibility would fall upon me if the troops came to grief,' I was on the north-west frontier at the time, nevertheless those men were never removed, and nothing could have prevented their promotion if they had lived. Now, on the contrary, owing to the very happy reforms which have been made of late years, those cases cannot occur. In the first place, such men cannot get into the army, and if they were there we should certainly get rid of them, and still more certainly they would never be able to obtain promotion."

The Commission would like to know if you can give them any information whether that is a fair representation of the state of things which existed before the late change?—I think it is a most inexplicable statement. I cannot conceive such a thing happening, because whenever a man is reported as being unfit for promotion the matter is gone into most carefully, and anyone who was a madman or an idiot would certainly not have been promoted.

3873. Under the old system?—Quite so; the case would have been investigated.

3874. I am speaking of the system generally?—I do not admit it in any respect, excepting to this extent, that of course there was more difficulty than there is at present in getting rid of an officer. If a man was not very competent, and it came to his turn for promotion, if there was not very decided proof of actual incompetence it was difficult to say, when a man could purchase, that he should not be allowed to do so; but now if a man were proved incompetent he never would

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

23 July 1875.

be promoted. The circumstance referred to must have been antecedent to my time, because Lord Sandhurst says it occurred when he commanded a regiment; he never commanded a regiment during the time that I have been at the Horse Guards. I cannot conceive it possible, without reference to its having occurred in my time, nor could I conceive its happening under the old system, as it is stated.

3875. One great difficulty which is thrown upon the Commission is to ascertain what would be the best mode of dealing with the difficulty which is impending with regard to the fixed establishment of general officers in connection with the Indian staff corps. We understand that difficulty to be of this nature, that at a given date, I think 1879, the senior colonel for promotion to the fixed establishment will be an Indian staff corps colonel, and that after that time for a considerable number of years the number of promotions which will fall to the Indian staff corps on to the fixed establishment of general officers will be very large indeed; so much so, that after a certain number of years, 15 or 20 years, the Indian staff corps officers will be in possession of more than half of the general officers' positions, whereas the proportion which is due to them as contrasted with the British army is 100 as against 275. At present we understand that the British officers have rather more that their 275, I think some 10 or 11 more than their share, and the question is what is the best way of meeting that difficulty. Will you favor the Commission with your opinion upon that point?—I think that the only way out of the difficulty is for the Indian Ltaff Corps to have a fixed establishment of their own, and to promote to their own fixed establishment without any reference to the Imperial list, exactly as the artillery and engineers do.

3876. Just as they did before this amalgamation?—Yes. I do not see how you can bring them together, because one is a case of qualifying promotion, and the other is a case of so many years' service giving a man rank.

3877. When you have two branches of the service in which the rules of promotion are not identical you cannot get them to act equally in bringing men up to the top of the general officers' establishment?—Quite so. You must of course be prepared for some amount of supersession of the imperial list by the younger members of the staff corps getting their own legitimate promotion.

3878. I was going to ask you whether there are not two distinct questions involved in this subject. One question is: How will you secure to each branch of the service its proper number of general officers' appointments? And the other question is, when you have done that, How will you prevent individuals on one branch superseding in point of standing individuals on another branch? The question of individual supersession appears to be a subordinate question, and not so important a question as that of the right number of general officers being apportioned to each establishment?—That is exactly the point; you have a choice of evils because you would like to bring the lists much together as you can in length of service, but as you cannot do that, a certain amount of supersession is much the lesser evil of the two in order to avoid this great disproportion of numbers which would arise if you adopted the intended system.

3879. Your Royal Highness is of opinion that there is no way of meeting the difficulty except by separating the establishments of general officers and giving a certain number to the Indian staff corps and a certain number to ours?—I cannot see any other way out of the difficulty, because, as you have stated, after a certain period there will be continuous promotion of staff corps officers, with the exception of now and then one individual British officer; that would be so very fatal and so very distasteful that I think you must do something of the kind you have suggested.

3880. Otherwise you would be denying to the British officers their fair and legitimate share of promotion?—Quite so; and you must add to that the consideration that it is a promotion which many of the officers in the British service would have a right to look to, because the present is one of recent adoption. You may say that the great bulk of the officers who entered our army a few years ago were entitled to look forward as a certainty to that amount of promotion which the number of 275 would give.

3881. You say you would separate the lists and put them in the same position as the artillery and engineers' lists are?—Yes.

3882. They being separate lists?—Yes they are separate lists; and I am anxious that it should be known that we had been considering this question long before this Royal Commission was appointed, and I have been extremely anxious that this question should be decided, because I know that at this moment the line officers are getting the advantage and because I thought it was unfair to the Indian officers to take the benefits for our line officer now, and then when the time arrived that the advantage would all be on their side, to say, We shall suffer so much now that we beg this system may be changed. I only wished to point out that there was no want of desire upon the part of the authorities more immediately connected with the Imperial army to draw attention to the circumstance in time to prevent what is now going on; the sooner that can be done the better, because the necessity for it is very pressing.

3883. If it is done, then the next question is, where should the line be drawn? Would it not be desirable to wait until the year 1879, when the next Indian staff corps colonel will come up to the top; because if it were done at once the result would be that a certain number of Indian staff corps colonels would come up as generals, and would take rank above the officers of the Imperial army?—I think that is a question which ought to be looked into carefully to ascertain whether, if you waited till that period, any injustice would accrue to them. The great object is to show a perfect equality of dealing with both branches of the service. I think the time should be so fixed as to act least to the disadvantage of the interests of both. I am not prepared to say at this moment what that time would be, but certainly if it could be put off to that period which you have suggested it would be an advantage so far to the line officers, because it would give less supersession. There is no doubt that at the first blush of it there would be considerable supersession upon the part of the staff corps officers over the line officers. In fact the proof of that is the large promotion of line officers going on now who otherwise would have been superseded.

3884. I understand your Royal Highness to say not only that this is the best plan, but that this is the only practicable plan?—The only plan. We have considered it over and over again, and the only solution which ever appeared to meet the case at all is the one which is now suggested.

3885. Now passing from that and considering what I will call the question of individual supersession, would it or would it not in your opinion be desirable that the rank of a man in either branch of the service should be, as it were, finally determined by the date of his colonel's commission, so that if he went up in his particular branch to become a major-general, and if another man went up in his branch to become a major-general, each man should take his place upon the major-general's list in accordance with the date of his commission as colonel; in other words that the date of his appointment as major-general should be fixed in accordance with the date of his commission as colonel. The effect of that would be of course that there would be no supersession, after each of the two men had arrived at the fixed establishment as major-general, they would then be put in the same places as they occupied upon the colonel's list, although of course that would not prevent a man in one branch becoming a major-general before his senior in another branch might do so?—That would be so, but the disadvantage would be that you never would get the younger men to the front. Take the case of Sir Garnet Wolseley who was promoted the other day for

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

23 July 1875.

his service in the field. If you were to go back to the date of his commission he would gain no advantage from his having become a major-general out of the ordinary course.

3886. He would have had the advantage of becoming a major-general earlier?—He would have had the advantage of becoming a major-general earlier undoubtedly.

3887. But my proposition was intended to exclude the cases of those who were put forward for special services, I was speaking of the general rule of promotion?—The plan you have suggested would keep them in their proper position better than any other plan which you could suggest, because of course the qualifying grade is that of colonel. If they have gained the rank of colonel, then of course their promotion goes on regularly from that period. The worst thing of all is this "leap-frogging" as it is called. We are suffering at this moment from an amount of "leap-frogging" which is quite painful. One day a man is a sub-lieutenant and another day he is a lieutenant, going over the heads of others. We have the case of a good officer who has gone down five or six places consecutively, merely from the new regulation of ante-dating commissions over his head, and my only fear is that this might end in something of a similar kind; and if it does it would have a very bad effect. I think as a rule they would rather take it for better or worse.

3888. One sees the evils of ante-dating one man over another man's head?—Quite so; one man may have a certain command though he may not be actually in command; a junior man then goes over his head and that is very inexpedient.

3889. That leads us to look a little more closely at what is the real character of this so-called supersession. In one branch of the service speaking of the ranks below that of colonel, it may happen that one man who enters the army at a certain date may find himself a captain after a certain period of service, and another man may enter at a much later date in another branch and find himself a lieutenant-colonel or a major at the same time. Now has the captain in the regiment which I have first mentioned any right to consider himself aggrieved because the officer who entered the army later in another branch of the service has attained a higher rank after a shorter period of service?—No; I think if you try to keep the various branches as far as you possibly can, very much upon the same conditions of promotion, there is no injustice to be complained of; the give and take which accident may produce would be quite understood and accepted, but I think if you give one branch a very great advantage over another, no doubt the one branch or branches, as the case may be, which are under the disadvantage would complain.

3890. That objection would fall under the general head, that the promotion was not so fast in the corps which complained as in some other?—I think that would not be so as between regiments, that is to say, if the 20th regiment had an advantage over the 21st from accidents of service, nobody would complain, but if it were found that the artillery had a great advantage over the engineers and the line, or that the engineers had a great advantage over the artillery, there would be a great outcry, whereas the other would be understood and be submitted to without any demur. I think there would be a great feeling as between the branches, it would be thought that the regulations were not justly laid down because they gave a great advantage to one over the other.

3891. Might it not happen from general circumstances that promotion in one branch was much more rapid than in another?—There is such *esprit-de-corps* in the regiments that I think it would be very much felt if there was any considerable difference. I do not think any reasonable difference would be at all felt; but of late there have been such immense supersessions that I think such a system is very much to be deprecated.

3892. Do you recognise any difference between the invidious comparison which may exist between the officers of the lower grades and the same comparisons in the upper grades; is not supersession as a colonel the same as it would be as a major?—No. I think supersession in the upper grades is much worse than in the lower grades because in the upper grades when a man gets to a certain period of life, unless he has attained the rank to which he thinks himself entitled, he is almost disqualified from going on with his service, whereas in the lower grades if a man is able to work he submits more cheerfully to any amount of accidental supersession which may occur.

3893. It was in view of that difficulty that the suggestion arose with reference to drawing the line at the colonel's rank and taking care that after the colonel's rank there should be no supersession?—I think it would be very difficult to manage without giving great offence in general.

3894. In your opinion would it be better to leave it as it is, that is to say, to separate the lists and allow the men to go forward to each list as general officers?—I think that would be much better than ante-dating.

3895. And to try as far as you could to make the rate of promotion equal in all branches?—I should endeavour to do so with a certain amount of give and take upon both sides, of which everybody would see the propriety. At the same time I must frankly state that this is quite a new idea to me. It never occurred to me, nor have I ever heard it mooted that there should be a change of this kind made. I have answered the question off-hand as it was put to me, but I think there might be serious objections to it.

3896. The rate of promotion for the Indian staff corps is not only fixed but proceeds upon certain determinate principles which insure a certain flow of promotion. Any other principles for other branches must be more or less flexible unless they are organised upon the same plan as the Indian staff corps, and therefore it would be difficult, would it not, to insure that promotion should go on at the same rate?—If you will allow me, I would rather consider the question, and write a letter to the Commission, or appear again to answer that point. I should not like to answer it off hand.

3897. Now going to another subject: we have considered amongst other questions the propriety of taking some step to relieve what I may call the half-pay list of colonels and officers under the rank of major-general. The new five years' warrant which is now in force, if it is maintained, will after every five years force on to half pay the lieutenant-colonels of regiments, and there they will remain on half pay till they become general officers. I believe that period is now something like 11 years. It has occurred to the Commission that it might be desirable to offer to officers placed in that position in future some means of retiring from the army upon pension, would you think that desirable?—Decidedly if the five years' rule is to be carried out it will be absolutely necessary to do it, because those men who have been on half pay for a lengthened period, however good officers they may be, become so rusty that they are not fit to take up active service again after a very few years. Everything changes so rapidly in the army now. Things change three or four times as rapidly as they used to do, and if a man goes out on half pay and does not resume active service for three or four years he is entirely out of hand, he has lost all connection with what is going on, and his value as an officer, however efficient he may have been, is lost to the state.

3898. Therefore, by the whole number staying on they stand in one another's way, whereas certain officers might go on if the list was cleared and others would go off?—It would be absolutely necessary to adopt that principle. I do not think you could enforce the five years' rule unless you made a very considerable hole in the colonel's rank by retirement.

3899. You would not apply compulsory retirement to effect that object, I presume?—I would always prefer to avoid it if I could. I think compulsory retirement is very distasteful, but at the same time I

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

23 July 1875.

may say that I think you would find it very difficult to avoid it.

3900. Should any pension given under those circumstances be in your opinion independent of any good service pension which the officer was entitled to?—I think it should stand alone. I think good service pension is a thing altogether apart from the retirement pay.

3901. You think when a man retires upon full pay he should not receive his good-service pension besides?—A good service pension is given to an officer upon full pay, but if an officer retires upon full pay we do not consider him eligible any more.

3902. My question is, whether, if we offered a sum to officers to retire voluntarily as colonels, that should be independent of their good-service pension, or should include it?—I do not think you ought to give a man a good-service pension after he had retired; if he has got it already he keeps it, but I would not otherwise give it him.

3903. We have been in some little difficulty in applying any system of promotion and retirement to the Guards. The organisation of the Guards is not exactly like that of the line, I believe?—It will be, but it is not at present.

3904. It seems to be in an indeterminate condition at present. Do I understand your Royal Highness to intimate that it will be organised upon similar principles to the line?—Upon similar principles to the line exactly. The only difference is that nothing has been very positively fixed with regard to the lieutenant-colonels or majors, as they are called, whether they are to have two classes of majors in future or not. At present they have not; but when the lower grades come upon the line system I think you will then be obliged to give them the same advantages as the line enjoys; but I do not think that that has been quite positively laid down. The lower grades have, however, been decided as far as this; that is to say, a lieutenant-colonel and captain is to be only captain, and a lieutenant and captain as at present will be only lieutenant, and so on.

3905. Then proceeding upwards from the captain, there must be some one between him and the lieutenant-colonel commanding?—At present there is only one major commanding a battalion, and two of the lieutenant-colonels and captains are what are called mounted officers. If they are assimilated altogether to the line, there will have to be two majors added to every battalion.

3906. But whether they are majors or not, we may consider that there will be two officers who will perform the functions of majors as they do now?—Quite so. I do not think it has been positively laid down, but it will have to be dealt with.

3907. What number of majors will there be?—There would be two to each battalion; the lieutenant-colonel of a battalion is now called major; each battalion has one major; it has no fixed major upon an equality with those of the line, but has several captains and lieutenant-colonels who do duty as mounted officers. They perform the duties of majors, they do not go on guard or perform that class of duty, but they literally are captains and lieutenants colonels.

3908. (*Maj.-Gen. Johnson.*) The five-years' rule does not apply to those captains performing the duties of majors I presume?—They are allowed to qualify after five years.

3909. (*Chairman.*) The terms of the royal warrant relating to the five-years' rule refer to majors and lieutenant-colonels; those officers I apprehend are not majors?—I presume those do not come under that qualification.

3910. But there are officers in the Guards who are really captains and lieutenant-colonels, but perform the functions of majors?—Yes.

3911. And it is your Royal Highness's expectation that they will be made majors eventually?—I apprehend there must be a rule of that description, otherwise they would not have their due proportion of field officers.

3912. (*Maj.-Gen. Herbert.*) The major of a battalion of Guards is a lieutenant-colonel commanding the Guards; the two senior captains who are allowed to qualify, seeing that they are allowed to qualify, must have some *status* for qualifying, and that *status* is that of major in a regiment. Then I presume their period would be only five years?—It is an eight years' qualification, not a five years', so they could not qualify to be full colonels. You could not remove them, because you would destroy their power of qualification; they are obliged to be eight years mounted officers before they can qualify.

3913. (*Chairman.*) The question has arisen with a view of accelerating promotion, whether (particularly in the corps of engineers) some facilities may not be given for engineer officers to accept positions in the civil service, particularly the Telegraph or some similar department, being seconded in that way, give rise to promotion in their regiment. If the flow of promotion in the engineers required some stimulant, would that in your opinion be a desirable way of dealing with the officers?—It depends very much upon what the appointments are. If they are appointments which have any bearing upon the military *status*, such as telegraphy for instance, it would be justifiable; but purely civil appointments I do not think ought to carry anything with them. In the Indian army there are certain appointments which are put entirely as civil appointments, while others are considered military.

3914. Taking for example the Telegraph department, you would see no objection to that?—No, that is a legitimate department, because it is very important for military matters as well, but there are civil posts such as civil commissionerships in India which I do not think ought to qualify.

3915. Therefore, unless it is in some way bearing upon the military service of the country, your opinion would be against such a practice?—Yes.

3916. But if it were in any way connected with the military service of the country you think it might be allowed seeing that it would be a saving of money to the service if you could allow them to take civil appointments and then second them?—Quite so, as long as it was understood that it was not a purely civil appointment. You have a Mint officer in Australia, I do not see why he should qualify.

3917. When you say "qualify" what do I understand Your Royal Highness to mean?—He is seconded but he does not qualify upon that appointment for colonel.

3918. I was not considering so much the question whether an officer would qualify as whether it was desirable to permit him, he being an officer in the engineers, to take a civil appointment?—I think you should give every legitimate appointment which you could give the engineer officers, but I would extend that to the army in general, and I would second them. I think it would be an immense advantage to the service. I would not suggest it merely for the engineers but for the whole army, because although it is very likely from their education and other circumstances that you would find the engineers particularly qualified for special appointments still you would find a variety of other officers of the army who would be qualified for certain appointments, but who could not take them because they would be obliged to leave the service altogether. Of course you should make the rule hold good that after a certain number of years a man should decide whether he intends to go on with military service or not because they get so entirely rusty after a certain time that they would be of no use, and it would be undesirable to take men back who had lost all connection with the service.

3919. I understood your Royal Highness in your first answers to have inferred that my question related to officers qualifying for advancement in the army?—Quite so.

3920. But understanding now that that was not the object of the question, but that it was to ascertain whether in your opinion it is desirable to allow officers to accept civil appointments and be seconded, you

answer yes, and that that should not only apply to the engineers but to the whole army?—Quite so.

3921. But that they should hold such appointments for a limited number of years only?—Yes, that they should after a limited number of years elect whether they would go on with their military duties or whether they would continue in the civil service; and if they continued in the civil service then that their connection with the military service should cease altogether.

3922. There is the Commissariat Department and some others which were mentioned to us in which the officers would be likely to be very useful; do you concur in that suggestion?—Yes, but in regard to the commissariat I would go further. I think the commissariat should be transferred altogether. If you transferred an officer as I suggested in my former evidence to the Commissariat Department, and he passed certain qualifications and was found therefore to be an efficient man for the purpose, then I think he should be transferred actually to that department of the service. My answer referred much more to real civil appointments, colonial and others. I am sure there are many colonial appointments which our officers would take with pleasure, and I believe that many colonial authorities would gladly get them to fill those posts, but they cannot get them because being military men they cannot be allowed to go.

3923. If that could be done it would be an immense advantage economically, would it not?—It would be an immense advantage to the State and to the service too. I wish to be understood as putting these gentlemen in a different position from the Commissariat or the Pay Department. Those qualified for these latter Departments ought to make up their minds to be continued altogether and not be seconded or merely seconded for a period of probation, and then transferred actually to that Department, but those I am talking of who might receive appointments such as you describe for telegraphy might I think be allowed to hold their appointments as seconded officers with the mere reservation that after a certain period of years, they must decide whether they will go on with the military service or not.

3924. (*Major-Gen. Johnson.*) Can your Royal Highness give any good reason why the rank of colonel should alone be considered in regulating the relation of officers as major-generals; why not the rank of lieutenant-colonels, as it was formerly, or the rank of major, or the date of first commission; is there any good reason in your opinion why you should arbitrarily select the rank of colonel?—The reason is because lieutenant-colonels are placed in more responsible positions than any subordinate officers. For instance, all the assistant-adjutant and quartermaster-generals of the army are as far as possible lieutenant-colonels; the commander of a regiment is a lieutenant-colonel. These appointments are appointments of considerable importance requiring qualifications which would satisfy the authorities that they are fit for higher posts, and therefore I think it is of great importance to confine it to the lieutenant-colonels upon that ground, though I admit it may happen, and has happened, that majors have done the duty very efficiently; but still, as a rule, there is no doubt they all ought to be, and all are, of the rank of lieutenant-colonel. The commander of the regiment, as a matter of course, and most of the staff appointments also, are of that rank.

3925. Before there was any question of supersession between the Indian and the Royal list of generals I do not think your Royal Highness expressed an opinion or was aware that there was any great jealousy as regards the artillery going over the line, or they over the engineers, they took their luck in their separate lists?—Quite so.

3926. And you were not aware that there were any grievances?—I think in those days the artillery and engineer officers were very much older, and there was some feeling that they were at a disadvantage because one was a promotion by pure seniority, and the other was a promotion by purchase, which gave great elasticity, and made the schism very wide, but now that they are all upon the same basis with regard to absence of purchase I do not think there can be much to complain of even admitting that there might be some disadvantage at some time or other with regard to the supersession. I think it was very much a feeling of purchase as against anti-purchase.

3927. Your Royal Highness in answer to the noble Chairman said you thought it very desirable that a means of exit for colonels on half pay should be afforded so that you might not have a number of officers claiming the rank of major-general who had not been in actual employment. Would your Royal Highness wish to see any limitation placed upon the colonels promoted to the rank of major-general such as that non-employment for a certain number of years should disqualify from that rank?—It would be a very great advantage if you could do it, but I do not think you could do it with justice, because the best man may have bad luck, he may have been his full period on half pay having been promoted during that time, and lose his chance of promotion.

3928. Though it would be advisable you think as I understand it would be almost impossible to carry it out?—I think it would be very difficult to carry it out. My own feeling as I stated previously is that I would like to see every general officer promoted from a regiment straight up, or within some very short period, within say a year or two of his promotion, those are the best officers we have to employ.

3929. But you do not see the means of doing it?—I do not see the means of doing it if you make it an absolute rule that a man is only to hold the command of a regiment for five years, but I have told you that I do not approve of that rule, and with reference to majors being put on half pay after five years, that is a most terrible prospect. You make them much less valuable to the State, and you diminish their prospects into the bargain.

3930. (*Chairman.*) Is there any other way of diminishing that difficulty except by giving them sums of money to retire?—That seems the only alternative.

3931. (*Major-General Herbert.*) Then we understand that if it were possible you think it would be very advantageous for the efficiency of the army that men should not be promoted who had been a lengthened period on half pay?—I think so. By half pay I mean unemployed, because a man may be on half pay, and he may have been employed upon a staff appointment. I do not object to such men being promoted, I only object to those men being promoted who are on half pay and not employed.

3932. (*Mr. Bouverie.*) Would your Royal Highness draw a distinct line with reference to the number of years that men have been unemployed, or would you leave it to the discretion of the authorities to determine, it might be that a man who was conspicuous might be just over the line of unemployed?—There is a difficulty in drawing a decided line in that respect, but as a matter of fact I am so convinced that being a long time unemployed on half pay, particularly in the grade of full colonel, would be so disadvantageous that I am satisfied the State loses by that officer being unemployed for so long, quite irrespective of the interests of the officer himself. I put it chiefly upon that ground, of course you must add also that the interests of the officer himself would be very much damaged, but I think the State would be damaged and the army would be injured as well.

3933. (*Major-General Herbert.*) Is there any probability that an officer of very distinguished merit would ever be left on half pay for any lengthened period?—That would entirely depend upon the opening you have for employing him. I think it would be very unjust to the general run of good officers to take a man of that sort and to constantly re-employ him; but I think it very likely might be done and that he would get an advantage over his neighbours, although it would be hard upon the others that they should be left out, not because they were inefficient, but because

H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.

23 July 1875.

you wished to go on pushing forward certain men who had had an opportunity of showing their worth.

3934. Would it assist your Royal Highness if a rule were made that no general officer who had been unemployed as a general officer for above six or seven years should obtain employment afterwards ?—Upon a former occasion I answered that question I think, and I said I thought if it was possible that a man who was not employed for a certain period of years after he became a general officer should *ipso facto* revert to a retired list, but I think I was asked then what was the number of years that should be prescribed, and I said it was very difficult to tell because it might so happen that a very efficient man could not get an appointment because there was none to offer him, the appointments bring very few in number. It would be very hard to put a man of that sort upon retirement because he had not been employed for a period during which you could not employ him ; still if you could carry out that plan in any way consistent with general justice to the whole body of officers of that rank, I think it would be very desirable.

3935. Would it not be necessary if a separate list were established for the Indian staff corps, to antedate the commissions of the major-generals of that corps in a similar way as is done with the British major-generals in order to prevent their being superceded by the major-generals of the local army ?—If upon consulting the lists of officers of the respective branches, it turned out that any great injustice would be done to the officers of the Indian staff corps by the supersession of the officers of the local army without some system of ante-dating was adopted, it might be necessary to adopt it, but whether that is so or not would require looking into, I am not prepared at the present moment to give an opinion upon the matter.

3936. (*Major-General Foster.*) The staff corps colonels if the lists were separated would naturally carry with them upon the separate list all the advantages which they would have had if they remained upon the Imperial list, is not that so ?—Not exactly that, they would carry all the advantages excepting those of the accidental promotion which their rank would give them to Imperial vacancies.

3937. If they had any advantage by being on a general list in respect of an ante-date given to them to prevent their supersession by the local officers they would naturally carry that advantage away with them when they were put upon the separdte list ?—If it were necessary.

3938. If they had it before they would have it still ?—Yes, quite so.

3939. Previous to a fixed establishment of general officers being given to the army there was no supersession after the rank of lieutenant-colonel except by an officer being made an *aide-de-camp* to the Sovereign ?—That was all.

3940. Therefore, if a rule was made preventing any supersession after the rank of full colonel it would be only reverting, would it not, to the old system which was in operation for many years in the army ?—Certainly, it was one which always existed.

3941. (*Chairman.*) It was in that view that I made the suggestion to your Royal Highness, that if we divided the list it might be desirable to recur to that old system and look upon a man when he attained his rank of colonel, as having attainted his final standing ?—So it always was formerly, but there was very great inequality of promotion under that system. One man might become a lieutenant-colonel much sooner than another man. In the Cavalry and the Guards I have no doubt the promotion was much quicker. In the Guards the promotion was so quick that the authorities were obliged to put considerable restrictions upon the advantages in operation prior to 1854, and even with that restriction it was always considered by the line that the supersession was very great, and no doubt the younger officers of the guards had advantages in that respect. The rule which existed then was that there was considerable supersession as regards the relative age, and still there was no system of ante-dating which you have suggested. To me that was completely a new view of the case, and I was not quite prepared to reply to it. I understood from General Foster that he put the question to me as if this had existed before, but I do not think it did.

3942. There was no ante-dating but promotion was given by a general brevet ?—But the result of that was that a man might be walking about London during the whole of his career and become a major-general while another might have been all over the world and only become the same. We have known men who became general officers upon the fixed establishment who had done no duty since they were captains, consequently it became necessary to provide that a man should perform some qualifying service as a condition precedent to his promotion.

Adjourned.

APPENDIX.

CONTENTS.

	Page
APPENDIX A.—Memoranda on the systems of promotion and retirement in force in Foreign Armies	199
APPENDIX B.—List of Royal Commissions and Committees on Army Promotion and Retirement	223
APPENDIX C.—Tables showing the rate of promotion under the Purchase system	223
APPENDIX D.—Tables showing the length of the service of the officers in the several ranks of the Army in 1871 and 1875	227
APPENDIX E.—Calculation showing the probable future cost and effect of the existing regulations for promotion and retirement	231
APPENDIX F.—Diagrams showing the relative proportions of the several ranks of the Army, and the numbers of officers in each rank on the 1st July 1875 who had obtained the positions they then held before and since the abolition of Purchase	238
APPENDIX G.—Calculations showing the number of vacancies required annually in each rank to secure promotion at the rate which existed under the Purchase system	239
APPENDIX H.—Calculation showing the results which would follow if all the retirements necessary to produce the promotion required were obtained in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel	241
APPENDIX I.—Returns of the number of retirements from the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers in each year from 1855 to 1875	241
APPENDIX J.—Letter from the Accountant General of the Army on the creation of supernumerary officers, &c. in the Royal Artillery in 1872	243
APPENDIX K.—Memoranda on the alterations of establishment and other special circumstances which have tended to quicken promotion in the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers since the Crimean War	247
APPENDIX L.—Calculations showing what would be the probable state of promotion in the Ordnance Corps in 1885 if no changes were made in the existing retirement regulations before that date	252
APPENDIX M.—Paper upon "Equivalent Annuities"	254
APPENDIX N.—Proposal for a re-organisation of the ranks of the Army as a means of obviating the necessity for compulsory retirement in the rank of Captain	256
APPENDIX O.—Calculation showing the probable cost and effects of a re-organisation of the Army such as that sketched in Appendix N.	257
APPENDIX P.—Calculation showing the value to officers of Infantry of the proposals of the Commission, as compared with the proposals made by the Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials	259
APPENDIX Q.—Statement of the average sums allowed as "Bonus" to officers who have retired on full pay since the abolition of Purchase	260
APPENDIX R.—Calculation showing the probable number of Brevet Colonels who would be on half pay, and the age at which the rank of Major-general would on an average be reached if no special retirements were offered to Brevet-Colonels, and no alteration made in the establishments of General Officers	260
APPENDIX S.—Proposal for a redistribution of the ranks of the corps of Royal Engineers in such a manner as to secure promotion on the average after given periods of service	261
APPENDIX T.—General Officers of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers	261
APPENDIX U.—Memorandum on Officers reported upon unfavourably in confidential reports	261
APPENDIX V.—Calculation showing the normal cost and effect of the proposals of the Commission compared with the cost and effects which would result from the existing regulations if continued in force	262
APPENDIX W.—Calculation showing the probable cost of the introduction of the scheme of the Commission for the Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line	274
APPENDIX X.—Calculation showing the probable cost of the introduction of the scheme of the Commission for the Ordnance Corps	279
APPENDIX Y.—List of Royal Commissions and Committees on questions connected with the amalgamation of the British and Indian Armies	281
APPENDIX Z.—Note on the succession of Officers of the British Army and of the Indian Staff Corps to the establishment of General Officers	281

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

Memoranda on the Systems of Promotion and Retirement in Foreign Armies.

Prepared in the Intelligence Branch of the Quartermaster-General's Department, Horse Guards, War Office, January 1875.

AUSTRIA.

I.—System of Promotion and Retirement.

A.—Promotion.

The regulations governing promotion are at the present moment being revised; those of 1869, in force hitherto, were not found to work well and had given great dissatisfaction to the senior officers, more especially on account of the extremely rapid advancement very young officers were able to obtain by passing the stringent examinations for "out of turn" in other words "selection promotion;" thus senior officers of each grade found themselves passed over by their juniors with perhaps only a few years service and possibly no war service, though themselves in every respect practically qualified for higher command. These regulations were framed by the late war minister, Baron Kuhn, who absolutely refused to consent to any modifications in favour of the seniority claims, a refusal which contributed not immaterially to his retirement in the spring of the present year. The details of the 1869 promotion system are given in full in the "Armed Strength of Austria," Part II., pages 111 to 118.

Immediately on the assumption of office by the presem. war minister, Baron Koller, a new commission was appointed to revise the existing regulations, which at once recommended that, pending the inquiry, no officer should be promoted in the selection list who had not passed into the first half of the general list of his grade. This recommendation, sanctioned by the Emperor, is, it must be observed, a very great concession to the senior officers, or in other words, to those dependent for advancement on seniority promotion, since its application in the case, for example, of the captains and subalterns makes it impossible for a candidate who has passed all the prescribed theoretical and practical examinations, to be promoted by selection unless he has held his present rank since the year 1866.

The new regulations will probably not be issued for some time, and no details are known of the system of promotion likely to be recommended; the present interregnum, proposed by the Commission and sanctioned by Imperial order, allows time for a full consideration of the seniority and selection claims; and the antagonism which has hitherto existed will probably be in some measure removed. The concession already made has been hailed as a favourable omen by the senior officers, and there can be little doubt that the new system will remove, at all events in part, the very unjust difficulties under which this class of officers lay.

B.—Retirement.

The system of retirement is also detailed in the "Armed Strength of Austria," Part II., pages 118 to 124; these regulations are still in force. In the Austrian army the officers are borne on only two *pay* lists, the active or effective and the pension or non-effective list. The latter includes a short list which may be classed as a half-pay list, on which supernumeraries, that is to say, officers granted a longer furlough than usual, or absent on sick leave, &c.; in other words temporarily non-effective, are mustered; their places are filled up in their regiments, but their names are still borne on the regimental roll, and they draw a lower rate of pay until re-absorbed: the number of officers on this list in 1872 amounted to 15 field, and 443 regimental officers. The officers of reserve and disembodied militia draw no pay unless called out for service; the same with officers on the retired list, the first category of whom are liable for service with a depôt or non-combatant establishment in time of war; the second category of this list consists of officers permanently unfit for service or superannuated on attaining the maximum age, viz., 60 The list of officers of reserve is, it may be observed, in great part filled by the one-year volunteer system; according to the results of the examination to which these persons are subjected after performing their year's service, they are appointed officers or non-commissioned officers of reserve, vide "Armed Strength of Austria," Part II., page 102. The conditions for retirement being detailed in full in the work referred to, it is unnecessary to go further into the subject here, excepting to point out that unless an officer is placed on the permanent retired list or retires finally from the army, he is, no matter on which list he is borne or to which class he retires, still liable for service of some kind in time of war, if physically fitted, and enjoys no military pay or allowances unless invalided on to the pension list or superannuated on attaining the maximum age of 60. The regulations with regard to pensions were undergoing revision at the time of the compilation of this work, and were in consequence omitted; a new law has since been issued, and is to come into operation shortly; as the conditions may be of interest the following summary is subjoined.

Pension Laws.

Any officer who has completed 10 years' service has a claim to *permanent* pension, if found by a military board totally unfit for military duty; if he has attained the maximum age of 60 years, or completed a total of 40 years' active service, he may be placed on the pension list at his own request irrespective of his fitness for service. Permanent pension may be granted in the following cases irrespective of the minimum length of service (10 years) laid down, viz.,—(*a.*) Incapacity arising from wounds received in action; (*b.*) Incapacity arising from aberration of intellect, blindness in both eyes, epilepsy, or total lameness; (*c.*) Incapacity arising from any accident or other disturbing cause, for which the officer cannot be held personally accountable, and which may render him unfit to perform military duty or any work enabling him to gain a living. Excepting in these or analogous cases, a service of under 10 years is rewarded by a *temporary* pension only; viz., if the unfitness has shown itself in the 1st or 2nd year's service, by a pension for one year; if in the 3rd or 4th, for two years; 5th or 6th, three years; 7th or 8th, four years; 9th or 10th, five years. The amount of annual pension for a service of 10 years completed is calculated at $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the full pay of the rank held; for 15 years completed at $\frac{3}{8}$th of the pay; for each succeeding year completed, an addition of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the pay; so that after completing 40 years' service the pension amounts to the full pay, and cannot be further increased. The lowest amount awarded is, however, fixed at 30*l.* The amount of the temporary pension, according to a service of under 10 years, is calculated at the same rate as the annual permanent pension for 10 years' completed service. As an example of the permanent pension basis, let us take the case of a colonel, whose full active pay is 252*l.** per annum; for a service of 10 years completed, he would receive a pension of $\frac{252}{3}$=84*l.* per annum; the same for any longer service up to 15 years completed, when he would receive $\frac{252 \times 3}{8}$ = 94*l.* 5*s.* per annum; for each succeeding year completed, this sum of 94*l.* 5*s.* would be increased by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the rate of full pay, *i.e.*, by 6*l.* 3*s.*; therefore after 25 years' additional service, making a total of 40 years, he would receive an annual pension of 94*l.* 5*s.* + (6*l.* 3*s.* × 25 =) 157*l.* 5*s.* = 252*l.*, or full pay.

* This figure has been taken by mistake; it is the old rate of colonels pay, the new rate is 300*l.* As it is only taken as an example, however, the error is not of consequence.

Such is the form of ordinary pension, classed as "award of permanent and temporary pension." This amount may be increased by pension for wounds, loss of limb, etc., as follows:—(*a.*) If the invaliding has arisen on account of wounds received in action, or from accident in the execution of duty in peace, by 20*l.* per annum; (*b.*) For the loss of one limb, 40*l.*; (*c.*) For the loss of two limbs, total blindness, or analogous cases, 90*l.*; provided in every case the unfitness for service arises within five years of the receipt of the wounds, etc. This is the second form of pension, classed as "award of increased pension for wounds."

There is still a third form furnished by the Military invalid Establishments, in which incapacitated officers of the pension list below the rank of captain inclusive may either be received in residence or from which they may be granted an allowance with free choice of residence; on being taken on the strength of this form of pension, they relinquish their former annual pension, and receive in lieu a pay calculated at 90 per cent. of the full active pay of the rank held, or if the pension previously enjoyed was of a higher value, then a similar amount of pay; those not brought into residence receive in lieu an additional 12*l.* per annum in the case of a captain, 8*l.* in the case of a subaltern; this third form of a pension is classed as "residence "in a military invalid establishment, or award of invalid "establishment stipend with free choice of residence."

The length of service is reckoned from the date of appointment to the army, or, in the case of officers commencing service in the ranks, from the date of enrolment. The age of conscription is 20, and the period of service 12 years, of which three active, seven reserve, and three landwehr.

II.—Proportion of Officers on the Active and Retired Lists.

The Estimates of 1872 show the following account of the Pension List:—

(*a.*) General List.

—	Rank.	Number.	Cost.
			£
General officers	Generals	26	17,013
	Lieutenant-generals	138	66,326
	Major-generals	186	57,418
	Total	350	140,757
Field officers	Colonels	394	77,387
	Lieutenant-colonels	399	49,306
	Majors	1,343	116,790
	Total	2,136	243,483
Regimental officer	Captains	3,574	224,952
	1st Lieutenants	1,218	46,214
	Lieutenants	1,023	32,225
	Total	5,815	303,391
	Sum total	8,301	687,631

The above list includes only combatant officers; surgeons, paymasters, and officials of various classes are purposely omitted as being foreign to the question at issue. It is the strength of the "ordinary form of permanent and temporary pension."

(*b.*) The list of officers on the strength of the Invalid Establishments was as follows:—

Class.	Number.	Cost.
		£
Officers in residence	123	8,208
Officers out of residence	77	5,247
Total	200	13,455

(*c.*) Besides these two lists, there is a list numbering in all 902 persons, as follows:—

Class.	Number.	Cost.
		£
Pensioned officers in the Civil Service of the State, in receipt of extra pension from the military chest.	261	3,814
Pensioned officers who have resigned rank and commission.	294	12,310
Pensioners, in accordance with the Warrant of 1868	347	13,361
Total	902	29,485

In this list there is no means of distinguishing the combatant from the non-combatant officers.

(*d.*) The pension vote also includes 411 persons in receipt of certain grants or allowances, for services rendered, at a cost of 8,640*l.*; as in the last list, there is no means of distinguishing the categories of the recipients.

(*e.*) Finally, there is the list of half-pay officers, or seconded officers, who draw their pay under the vote for pensions; this list in 1872 stood as follows:—

—	Class.	Number.	Cost.
			£
Field officers	Colonels	3	548
	Lieutenant-colonels	5	718
	Majors	7	651
	Total	15	1,917
Regimental officers	Captains	117	6,574
	1st Lieutenants	135	4,547
	Lieutenants	191	5,350
	Total	443	16,471
	Sum total	458	18,388

Supposing one-third to be struck off the lists headed (*c*) and (*d*) for non-combatant officials and employés, who, as already observed, are here massed with the combatant officers, a tolerably accurate estimate of the strength and cost of the pension list will be obtained, thus:—

Category.	Number.	Cost.
		£
(*a.*) List	8,301	687,631
(*b.*) „	200	13,455
(*c.*) „ less ⅓rd	600	20,657
(*d.*) „ „	278	5,760
(*e.*) „	458	18,388
Total	9,837	745,893

Or deducting the (*e*) list, which, though coming under the head of pensions, does not properly appertain to what is understood by a retired list, we get the number of officers 9,379, and the cost 727,505*l.*

The vote for pensions in 1872 was taken at a total of 932,400*l.*, of this, 144,269*l.* was required for the pensions of 2,020 officials, such as chaplains, auditors, surgeons, veterinary staff, intendence, paymasters, &c., &c., &c., who, as before observed, are purposely omitted in the calculations as foreign to the question at issue; and a further sum of 25,235*l.* for the pension of 1,093 persons of inferior classes employed as messengers, &c. The vote does not include the pensions of the non-commissioned officers and men, which are taken separately. The balance covers certain miscellaneous expenditure, gratuities attached to medals, &c.

The active list, inclusive of officials and non-combatants, numbers (vide Armed Strength of Austria, Part II., page 220), 14,531; about 2,500 should be struck off to cover the number of officials, &c., which would leave the strength of the combatant active list about 12,000, giving the proportion of officers on the active and retired list about 6 to 5.

III.—Rates of Retired Pay or Allowance as compared with Rates of Full Pay.

The rates of Full Pay are as follows:—

Diet Class.*	Rank.	In Peace.	In War.
		£	
I.	Field-marshal	1,050	Increase of 33 p.c.
III.	General	840	„ 34 „
IV.	Lieutenant-general	630	„ 68 „
V.	Major-general	420	„ 85 „
VI.	Colonel	300	„ 85 „
VII.	Lieutenant-colonel	210	„ 85 „
VIII.	Major	168	„ 85 „
IX.	1st Captain	120	„ 90 „
	2nd „	90	„ 120 „
X.	1st Lieutenant	72	„ 75 „
	Lieutenant	60	„ 90 „

(The same for all arms.)

* All officers and officials in Austria receive pay and allowances according to their rank on the Diet Class; thus, for example, an official or employé, whether civil or military, of the VII. Class receives the same pay and allowance as a lieutenant-colonel.

The rates of Command Pay are as follows :—

Office.	Rate per Annum.
	£
War minister	840
Deputy to war minister	210
W.D. chiefs of sub-department	102
Inspector-general of clothing	102
„ „ Artillery	204
„ „ Engineers	314
Imperial Chancellery	84 to 63
Consultative officers of W.D.	50
Generals commanding general districts	480
„ „ military „	150
Personal staff	210 to 12
Chief of general staff	420
Educational department	120 to 12

All officers are entitled to furnished quarters in barracks, or, if quarters are unfurnished, to a furniture allowance; or if no quarters are available to a lodging and furniture allowance; also to coachhouse and stabling allowances for the number of carriages and horses allowed by regulation.

The scale of quarters is as follows :—

Diet Class.	Rank.	Rooms.	Offices.	Kitchens.	Servant's room.	Cellars.
I.	Field-marshal and officers commanding general districts.	8	2	2	1	1
III.	Other officers of the rank of general.	7	2	1	1	1
IV.	Lieutenant-general	6	2	1	1	1
V.	Major-general	5	2	1	1	1
VI.	Colonel	5	1	1	1	1
VII., VIII.	Lieutenant-colonel or major	4	1	1	1	1
IX.	Captain	3	1	1	1	1
X.	Subaltern	2	—	1	1	1

According to the diet class on which they rank, the allowance of furniture is given on the following scale :—

General and Field Officers. { *Classes I. to VIII. inclusive;* bed and bedding complete, wardrobe, 2 chests of drawers, 6 tables, 12 chairs, 1 sofa, with mirror, clothes' hooks, washstand, towel horse, and the necessary toilette articles.

Captain. *Class IX.;* the same, excepting that there is no sofa and only 1 chest of drawers, 4 tables, and 4 chairs.

Subaltern. *Class X.;* the same as for Class IX., excepting 2 in place of 4 tables.

The furniture allowance when unfurnished quarters are provided is for general officers, 6*l.* 6*s.*; field-officers, 5*l.*; captain, 3*l.* 10*s.*; and subaltern, 2*l.* 10*s.* per annum.

The lodging and furniture allowance when no quarters are provided varies with the class of town, (there are in all eight classes besides Vienna), from, for a *general*, 146*l.* in Vienna to 28*l.* in towns of the eighth class; *lieutenant-general*, 126*l.* to 25*l.*; *major-general*, 106*l.* to 21*l.*; *colonel*, 77*l.* to 18*l.*; *lieutenant-colonel* or *major*, 59*l.* to 13*l.*; *captain*, 40*l.* to 10*l.*; *subaltern*, 26*l.* to 6*l.*, per annum. In the same way *coach-house* allowance varies from 5*l.* to 17*s.*; and *stabling allowance* from 10*l.* to 17*s.*

Forage allowance is given for the number of chargers to which the officer is entitled by regulation.

All officers entitled to forage allowance receive also a so-called horse-allowance at the rate of 3*l.* per annum in Cavalry, and 4*l.* 4*s.* in the other arms, for each horse; and all regimental officers of Cavalry receive a so-called Cavalry allowance of 12*l.* per annum.

Great facilities are given to officers of all arms to provide themselves with horses; for further details see "Part II. Armed Strength of Austria, Chapter IX."

All field and regimental officers are entitled to a soldier servant, or a money equivalent fixed at 9*l.* 12*s.* per annum. The servants of regimental officers are clothed in a special uniform by government, those of field-officers are clothed by the officers themselves, who receive a clothing allowance of 1*l.* 16*s.* per annum. Every officer entitled to a soldier servant receives also a servant's furniture allowance of 15*s.* per annum.

The above allowances must all be taken into consideration in estimating the value of the full pay of the Austrian officer, moreover it must be borne in mind that he has no deductions made for forage, band, etc.; that living is as a rule cheap; that he is enabled to get his uniform from government stores at a low rate of cost; and, finally, may live as expensively or economically as he pleases, or as his tastes and purse require.

The appended table shows the cost, under the principal heads, taken in the army estimates for each grade in the field and regimental ranks of the Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery; the scale of pay and horse allowances is normal, other items such as forage, lodging allowance, etc. are the average: the table does not pretend to show what each grade actually receives in cash, but rather the cost to government. Servants allowances are purposely omitted.

TABLE showing the GOVERNMENT COST of each GRADE in the three PRINCIPAL ARMS.

	Number of Horses for which Forage is allowed.	Pay.	Cavalry Allowance.	Horse Allowance.	Lodging and Furniture Allowance.	Stabling Allowance.	Forage Allowance.	Total.
Infantry.		£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Colonel commandant	4	300	—	16·8	43·8	12·6	69·8	443
Colonel	3	300	—	12·6	43·8	9·4	52·4	418·2
Lieutenant-colonel	3	210	—	12·6	34·3	9·4	52·4	318·7
Major	2	168	—	8·4	34·3	6·3	34·9	251·9
1st Captain	1	120	—	4·2	25·9	3·1	17·4	170·6
2nd „	—	90	—	—	25·9	—	—	115·9
1st Lieutenant	—	72	—	—	15·8	—	—	87·8
Lieutenant	—	60	—	—	15·8	—	—	75·8
Cavalry.								
Colonel	5	300	—	15	35·6	11·7	84·8	447
Lieutenant-colonel	5	210	—	15	29·5	11·7	84·8	351
Major	4	168	—	12	29·5	9·4	67·9	296·7
Captain	3	120	12	9	22	7	50·9	221
1st Lieutenant	1*	72	12	3	13·3	2·3	16·9	120
Lieutenant	1*	60	12	3	13·3	2·3	16·9	109
Artillery.								
Colonel commandant	4	300	—	16·8	51·1	16·4	71·6	456
Lieutenant-colonel	3	210	—	12·6	41·8	12·3	53·7	330
Major	2	168	—	8·4	41·8	8·2	35·8	262
1st Captain	1*	120	—	4·2	30·6	4·1	17·9	177
2nd „	1*	90	—	4·2	30·6	4·1	17·9	147
1st Lieutenant	—*	72	—	—	18·9	—	—	91
Lieutenant	—*	60	—	—	18·9	—	—	79

* These ranks are allowed one Government charger. The figures in this column refer to private horses only.

APP. A. AUSTRIA.

This table does not include the pay and allowances of the general officers of each arm, nor the scale of command pay, which varies with the office held; all further details will be found in the chapter on "Pay and Allowances" of the work previously referred to.

Such then being the rates of full pay, it remains to compare with them the rates of pension or retired pay, and to obtain this, reference must be made to the first head dealt with, showing the basis on which pension is calculated. The following table shows the quinquennial progressive scale from the minimum pension, awarded for a service of 10 years completed:— AUSTRIA.

Rank.	Full Active Pay.	Permanent Pension (Retired Pay) for a completed Service of						
		10 Years.	15 Years.	20 Years.	25 Years.	30 Years.	35 Years.	40 Years.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Field-marshal	1,050	350	394	525·25	656·50	787·75	919·00	1,050
General	840	280	315	420	525	630	735	840
Lieutenant-general	630	210	236	314·75	393·50	472·25	551·0	630
Major-general	420	140	158	210·5	263·0	315·5	368·0	420
Colonel	300	100	113	150·5	188·0	225·5	263·0	300
Lieutenant-Colonel	210	70	79	105·25	131·5	157·75	184	210
Major	168	56	63	84	105	126	147	168
1st Captain	120	40	45	60	75	90	105	120
2nd „	90	40	34	45·25	56·5	67·75	79	90
1st Lieutenant	72	30*	30*	36	45	54	63	72
Lieutenant	60	30*	30*	30	37·5	45·0	52·5	60

* 30*l.* is the lowest amount awarded as pension.

IV.—Approximate Cost of the Active List as compared with the Retired List.

Subjoined is the actual number of active officers provided for by the army estimates of 1872:—

How employed.	Field-marshals.	Generals.	Lieut.-generals.	Major-generals.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Majors.	1st Captains.	2nd Captains.	1st Lieutenants.	Lieutenants.	Total.
Central administration	—	1	13	8	15	15	24	110	49	39	15	289
Troops	1	9	42	98	216	237	496	1,983	831	3,487	3,547	10,947
Educational establishments	—	—	—	3	3	10	13	45	19	64	15	172
Administrative establishments	—	—	—	—	10	12	23	92	41	125	62	365
Military geographical institute	—	—	—	—	3	1	5	9	4	40	—	62
Sanitary department (A.H.C.)	—	—	—	—	1	2	5	17	7	33	21	86
Administration of pension department.	—	—	—	2	1	1	4	—	—	3	—	11
Military prisons	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Miscellaneous	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
Total	1	10	55	111	254	278	570	2,256	951	3,791	3,660	11,937

The cost of this list in actual pay would be as follows:—

Number.	Rank.	Rate.	Amount.
		£	£
1	Field-marshal	1,050	1,050
10	Generals	840	8,400
176 — 55	Lieutenant-generals	630	34,650
111	Major-generals	420	46,620
254	Colonels	300	76,200
1,102 — 278	Lieutenant-colonels	210	58,380
570	Majors	168	95,760
2,256	1st Captains	120	270,720
951	2nd „	90	85,590
10,658 — 3,791	1st Lieutenants	72	272,952
3,660	Lieutenants	60	219,600
11,937		Total	1,189,922

In order to arrive at the actual cost, the same items require to be calculated as appear in the tabular statement of the amounts taken in the army estimates for each grade of the three principal arms, as well as the command pay and allowances of the general, and other specially employed officers. As these items are massed for all grades in the estimates, it is impossible without going into very minute and detailed examination, in point of fact, without calculating each individual officer *per se*, to arrive at more than an approximate estimate of the cost; roughly, the results obtained are as follows:—

	£
Command pay and allowances	12,344
Horse and cavalry	44,948
Lodging and stabling	386,067
Forage	154,527
Total	597,886
Adding to this the amount of the actual pay list	1,189,922
The gross cost of the active list appears to be	1,787,808

One item is still wanting to make the amount complete, namely, the servants' allowance; every individual of the field and regimental ranks, is, as has been already stated, allowed a man, or a money allowance in lieu, and field officers are entitled to a servant's clothing allowance; moreover, every officer entitled to a soldier servant is allowed a servant's furniture allowance at the rate of 15*s.* per annum.

The money equivalent, in lieu of servant, may be fairly neglected; the clothing allowance to which field officers are entitled would amount, for 1,102 persons, at 1*l.* 16*s.* to a sum of 1,988*l.*; and the furniture allowance for 11,760 persons (1,102 field, and 10,658 regimental officers) at 15*s.*, to a sum of 8,820*l.*; total under this head 10,808*l.*

This item is taken separately, as it perhaps should scarcely be included in the calculation of the cost of the list of officers; added to the previous estimate, it gives the total cost of the active list 1,798,616*l.*

The cost of the pension list was shown under Head II. to be 745,893*l.*, or exclusive of the small so-called half-pay list 727,505*l.*

William S. Cooke,
Captain 22nd Regiment,
D.A.Q.M.G.

BELGIUM.

Promotion.

BELGIUM.

A non-commissioned officer cannot be promoted to be a sub-lieutenant unless (1) he is 18 years of age at least; (2), he has served actively for at least two years as a non-commissioned officer in his regiment or corps, or has been for two years a student at the military school, or fulfilled the requisite conditions, on leaving, for promotion to the rank of sub-lieutenant.

No officer can be promoted to be a lieutenant until he has served at least two years as a sub-lieutenant.

A lieutenant must have served at least two years as such before he can be promoted to be a captain.

A captain cannot be promoted to be a major unless he has served at least three years as captain.

No major can be promoted to be lieutenant-colonel unless he has served at least three years as a major.

A lieutenant-colonel must serve at least two years as such before he can become a colonel.

No officer can be promoted to a rank higher than that of colonel until he has served for at least three years in the rank next below it.

In time of war, the period of service required for promotion from one rank to another is reduced by one-half.

The only exceptions to the above rule are promotion earned by distinguished conduct in the field published in general orders, and in case the number of vacancies cannot be filled up otherwise, in the presence of the enemy.

In *Infantry* and *Cavalry*, one-third of the number of vacancies in the sub-lieutenants are filled up from the non-commissioned officers of the regiment; the remaining two-thirds by the Crown. The latter are selected from the students at the military school and from non-commissioned officers.

Vacancies amongst the sub-lieutenants of *Artillery* and *Engineers* are filled up exclusively from students at the military school, and non-commissioned officers of Artillery and Engineers who are selected after examination as to their capabilities. Two-thirds at least are given to the former.

One-half the vacancies in the lieutenants and captains in *every branch* of the service are filled up according to seniority from the rank below, throughout the whole of each branch of the service. The remainder are selected by the Crown.

Superior and general officers are appointed by the Crown.

Seniority is determined by the date of the commission of any rank, and by the classification of the officers in cases where the officers were appointed on the same day.

No step of rank can be given to any officer unless he is to be employed in that rank. No higher step can be bestowed than that in which the officer is employed. Honorary rank is given only to officers who have retired from the service.

Officers on the non-active list, who have been placed on it either in consequence of their regiments being reduced or of the abolition of the office which they have held, are allowed to be promoted by seniority and are placed in a corps of the branch of the service to which they belong, whilst waiting for employment. Officers who are placed on the non-active list from any other cause can claim no right to promotion by seniority; the period of time passed on the non-active list will be deducted from the period which determines seniority, when they are brought back to active service.

Officers who return to active duty have deducted from seniority the period which they may have spent in any service other than that of the Belgian war department. To this rule, however, there are the following exceptions:—

1. Detached duty with the active Civic Guard, or as officer instructors in the sedentary Civic Guard, at the request of the local authorities.
2. In the Military Marine.
3. As Engineers, in the Bridges and Roads Corps.
4. On a diplomatic mission.
5. Period passed in the service of any foreign power, with royal sanction.

Officers who may be made prisoners of war retain their right of seniority for promotion, but can only obtain the step next above that which they held at the time they were taken prisoners.

Pay of Officers.

The officers of the Belgian army are placed on four distinct lists, namely—

1. The active list.
2. The list "en disponibilité" or unattached list.
3. The non-active list.
4. The half-pay list.

Active list.—Those officers who are on the active list belong to the cadres of the army and are in active employment. Officers employed on special missions, or special service, retain their positions on the active list.

Unattached list.—Officers on the list "en disponibilité" or unattached, are general or superior officers who belong to the cadres of the army, but who are not for the time employed actively. These officers receive two-thirds of the pay of their active rank.

Non-active list.—Officers on the non-active list have no cadre, and are not employed. The pay of these officers is two-fifths of the active pay of Infantry officers for all ranks from colonel to sub-lieutenant, irrespective of the branch of the service to which the officer belongs.

Officers on the half-pay list receive an amount of pay according to the rank they hold in the army. They cannot be deprived of the whole or part of their pay unless they lose their rank. Officers are liable to be put on half-pay for the following causes:—

1. Violence in resisting disciplinary punishment.
2. Disobedience, serious and repeated, and habitual misconduct.
3. Gross negligence in the performance of duties.

The half-pay of officers of all ranks and arms of the service is one-half that of officers of corresponding rank on the non-active list.

Officers on the unattached list, the non-active list, and the half-pay list are subject to military law, and the orders of the minister of war.

Pay.

The following table shows the amount of full pay, unattached pay, non-active pay, and half-pay of the various ranks in the regiments and corps of the Belgian army:—

Infantry.

Rank.	Active Pay.	Unattached Pay.	Non-active Pay.	Half-Pay.
Regimental Staff.	£	£	£	£
Colonel	340	—	136	68
Lieutenant-colonel	260	—	104	52
Major	220	—	88	44
Capitaine-Adjudant-major	152	—	61	30½
Lieutenant or Sub-lieutenant, Adjudant-major.	94	—	39	19½
„ „ Standard Bearer	78	—	31	15½
„ „ Paymaster	94	—	39	19½
Active Battalion.				
Captain	136	—	56	28
Lieutenant	84	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	72	—	29	14½
Companies of Reserve Battalions.				
Captain	136	—	56	28
Lieutenant	84	—	33	16½
Staff of Depôts.				
Majors	220	—	88	44
Captains, Quartermasters	152	—	61	30½
Depôt Companies.				
Captain	136	—	56	28
Lieutenant	84	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	72	—	29	14½

Note.—20 captains and 20 lieutenants are borne on the cadres of the Belgian infantry as "à la suite" unattached. These really form a reserve of officers and receive a special rate of pay, viz., captains, 136*l.*; lieutenants, 98*l.* per annum. The higher rate of subalterns pay is probably given in lieu of servants and quarters.

Pay of Officers of Cavalry.

Rank.	Active Pay.	Unattached Pay.	Non-active Pay.	Half-Pay.
Regimental Staff.	£	£	£	£
Colonel	380	—	136	68
Lieutenant-Colonel	284	—	104	52
Major	252	—	88	44
Capitaine-Adjudant-major	204	—	61	30½
Lieutenant „	146	—	39	19½
Capitaine Instructeur	204	—	—	—
Lieutenant or Sub-lieutenant Standard bearer.	121	—	31	15½
Captain Quartermaster	152	—	—	—
Lieutenant, Paymaster	94	—	39	19½
Active Squadrons.				
Captain Commanding	204	—	56	28
Second Captain	168	—	—	—
Lieutenant	130	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	112	—	29	14½
Depôt Squadron.				
Captain Commandant	204	—	56	28
Lieutenant	130	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	112	—	29	14½

APP. A. BELGIUM

Pay of Officers of Artillery.

Rank.	Active Pay.	Unattached Pay.	Non-active Pay.	Half-Pay.
Regimental Staff.	£	£	£	£
Colonel	380	—	136	68
Lieutenant-colonel	284	—	104	52
Major	252	—	88	44
Capitaine Commandant Adjudant-major.	204	—	61	30½
Lieutenant Adjudant-major	146	—	39	19½
Captain Instructor	204	—	—	—
Captain Quartermaster	152	—	—	—
Lieutenant Paymaster	94	—	39	19½
Captain, Administrateur d'habillement.	136	—	—	—
Horse Batteries.				
Captain Commandant	204	—	56	28
Second Captain	168	—	—	—
Lieutenant	130	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	112	—	29	14½
Field Batteries.				
Captain Commandant	204	—	56	28
Second Captain	168	—	—	—
Lieutenant	130	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	112	—	29	14½
Siege Batteries.				
Captain Commandant	184	—	56	28
Second Captain	—	—	—	—
Lieutenant	110	—	33	16½
Sub-lieutenant	94	—	29	14½

Pay of Officers of Engineers.

Rank.	Active Pay.	Unattached Pay.	Non-active Pay.	Half-Pay.
	£	£	£	£
Colonel	380	—	—	190
Lieutenant-colonel	284	—	—	142
Major	252	—	—	126
First Captain Adjudant-major	204	—	—	102
Lieutenant Adjudant-major	126	—	—	63
Captain Quartermaster	152	—	—	76
Sub-lieutenant, Paymaster	88	—	—	44
Captain, Administrateur d'habillement.	136	—	—	68
Companies.				
First Captain	184	—	—	92
Second Captain	148	—	—	74
Lieutenant	110	—	—	55
Sub-lieutenant	94	—	—	47

Officers in the Belgian Army.

The following gives the number of officers in active employment in the Belgian Army, according to the army estimates for 1874:—

	Number.	
General Staff: (Active section.)		
Lieutenant-generals	9	
Major-generals	18	
(Reserve section) lieutenants and major-generals	6	
Other officers of the general staff	46	
		79
Staff of Provinces and Towns:		
Provinces	5	
Towns	41	
		46
Intendance:		
Intendants		35
Sanitary:		
Medical officers, &c.		71
Infantry:		
Officers of all ranks		1,852
Cavalry:		
Officers of all ranks		360
Artillery:		
Artillery staff	63	
Officers of all ranks	502	
		565
Engineers:		
Engineer staff	54	
Gardes	50	
Officers of all ranks	87	
		191
Administration Battalion:		
Officers of all ranks		74
Grand total		3,273

Non-active List.

BELGIUM.

The following are the officers who appear in the army estimates for 1874, on the non-active list, with the amount paid to each:—

		£
1	Colonel	170
2	Majors (165*l.* each)	330
15	Captains, first class (114*l.* each)	1,710
2	„ „ (76*l.* each)	152
8	„ second class (112*l.* each)	896
4	„ „ (68*l.* each)	272
3	„ third class (90*l.* each)	270
4	„ „ (60*l.* each)	240
7	Lieutenants (63*l.* each)	441
7	„ (42*l.* each)	294
3	Sub-Lieutenants (54*l.* each)	162
6	„ (36*l.* each)	216
Total - 62		5,253

T. Jessop,
Captain, Scots Greys,
D.A.Q.M.G.

DENMARK.

DENMARK.

The very peculiar system in use in this army makes it essential to examine, in the first place, the method of appointment to the commissioned grades, for there is no direct admission. Every man whatever his social position has to commence service in the ranks, undergo the ordinary recruit drill, and pass successfully the corporals' school and the junior class of the officers' school before being eligible for the junior commissioned post, viz., 2nd lieutenant, on the *temporary pay and duty effective;* under favourable circumstances he may attain to this rank in two years. To attain to the junior post on the *permanent pay and duty effective; i.e.*, 1st lieutenant, he must now pass one or more of the other classes (there are four in all) of the officers' school, and perform a certain practical service with his arm. It takes, as a rule, three years to advance from 2nd to 1st lieutenant; supposing, therefore, the candidate for commissioned rank to commence his recruit service at 18, which he may do as a so-called "volunteer" (the age for conscription is 22 completed), he may become 1st lieutenant at 23.

Service in the Danish army, it must be observed, is divided into eight years "line and reserve," and eight years "augmentation," a kind of second reserve, total 16 years; while the commanding ranks are classed on three categories; viz.,—

(*a.*) Temporary pay and duty line effective.
(*b.*) Permanent „ „ „
(*c.*) Augmentation effective.

Those of the (*b.*) category alone have claim to pension for length of service, though all persons may receive pension for distinguished conduct, &c. in the field.

There are only four grades of officers, viz., (*a.*) general, (*b.*) colonel, (*c.*) captain, (*d.*) lieutenant. In the line, the grade of lieutenant has two ranks, viz., 1st and 2nd lieutenant; in the augmentation it has only one rank, viz., lieutenant. The term lieutenant, therefore, applies to the augmentation service only; the term 2nd lieutenant, to the temporary pay and duty line effective only; and the term 1st lieutenant to the permanent pay and duty line effective only. While the latter are employed continously, the 2nd lieutenants are retained at duty or dismissed on furlough according to requirement, and the lieutenants are only called up with the augmentation battalions, receiving pay when on duty. These distinctions it is necessary to bear in mind.

I.—System of Promotion and Retirement.

(*a.*) *Promotion and Retirement of the Commanding Ranks of the Line Effective.*

The 1*st lieutenants* are made, as has been shown, by the promotion of 2nd lieutenants who have passed the highest class but one of the officers' school, and are certified in every respect fit in the practical discharge of their duties; no 2nd lieutenants can, however, be promoted after the age of 32 completed.

Captains are made by the promotion of 1st lieutenants, after a minimum service of four years in that rank; every third step is given by selection; no 1st lieutenant can be promoted after the age of 42 completed.

Colonels are made by the promotion of captains, after a minimum service of four years in that rank; every step is given by selection; no captain can be promoted after the age of 52 completed.

Generals are made by the promotion of qualified colonels; every step is given by selection; no colonel can be promoted after the age of 65 completed.

The fitness for promotion is determined in every case by the qualification returns prepared by the commanding officers on their subordinate ranks; separate returns are framed for seniority and selection promotion.

Captains can claim retirement with pension on completing their 52nd year; their retirement is compulsory on completing their 55th year.

1st lieutenants can claim retirement with pension on completing their 42nd year; their retirement is compulsory on completing their 45th year.

In the case of a colonel or general, retirement with pension is compulsory on completing the 65th and 70th year respectively.

(*b.*) *Promotion and Retirement of the Commanding Ranks of the Augmentation Effective.*

These ranks are made, as a rule, by the transfer of officers from the line effective on completing their obligatory period of service with the colours, but they may be appointed direct. It is laid down, however, that no person on this effective is to be promoted more than one step above that he held when he passed from the line effective, without performing a renewed service in the line, the duration of which is determined in each case by superior authority. An officer transferred to the augmentation from the line may be appointed, if qualified, direct to the rank next higher; thus, in the case of a 1st lieutenant, he may, on completing his eight years line service, retire to the augmentation with the rank of captain; but he could not advance to the rank of colonel without voluntarily performing a renewed line service.

Promotion takes place from serjeant to lieutenant, and lieutenant to captain, &c. No person can be appointed serjeant or lieutenant to the augmentation, however, if over 36 years of age completed; or captain if over 45 completed. The officers of this class of service can claim their retirement, or would be discharged compulsorily, on completing the same ages as the corresponding ranks in the line, but they would not be entitled to pension.

III.—RATES OF RETIRED PAY OR ALLOWANCES AS COMPARED WITH RATES OF FULL PAY.

(*a.*) *Pay.*

The rates of active pay are as follows:—

		I.	II.	III.
		CLASS OF PAY.		
		£	£	£
The same for all arms.	General	445	388	—
	Colonel	334	289	244
	Captain	200	166	133
	1st Lieutenant	83	66	50

This, however, includes lodging-money, for with very few exceptions all officers live out of barracks, and provide their own quarters; if quarters are provided in barracks or other military buildings a deduction is made from the pay at the following rate, viz.:—

	£	
General	55	per annum.
Colonel	36	,,
Captain	22	,,
1st Lieutenant	8	,,

All officers required to be mounted are furnished with Government horses, or if they prefer to provide their own horses receive a sum of about 4*l.* 10*s.* annually for each horse allowed by regulation.

In the augmentation service, a colonel receives a so-called honorary pay at the rate of 66*l.* and a captain at the rate of 44*l.* per annum, while a lieutenant receives pay when called out at the rate of 40*l.* per annum during the time of his employment. 2nd lieutenants of the temporary pay and duty line effective receive the same salary when employed as lieutenants of the augmentation.

(*b.*) *Pension.*

Every officer of the permanent pay and duty effective has claim to pension if invalided from the service on account of wounds received in action, or accident met with in the discharge of duty in peace, or illness acquired on military service, otherwise only on attaining the superannuation age, or the compulsory retirement age. *Vide* page 17.

The rate of pension is calculated on the average scale of the pay and allowances enjoyed during the last five years' service preceding the discharge, or if the service has been of less than 5 years then on the average rate of the pay of that lesser service, viz.:—

Service of under 2 years	$\frac{1}{10}$th.
,, from 2 to 4 years	$\frac{2}{10}$ths.
,, ,, 4 to 7 ,,	$\frac{3}{10}$ths.
,, ,, 7 to 10 ,,	$\frac{4}{10}$ths.
,, ,, 10 to 20 ,,	$\frac{5}{10}$ths.
,, ,, 20 to 21 ,,	$\frac{31}{60}$ths.

For each year above 21 up to 29 $\frac{1}{60}$th more, and for a service of over 29 years, $\frac{2}{3}$rds of the average annual rate of the pay and allowances of the five years preceding the discharge.

The pension may be still further increased under certain circumstances, *e.g.*, if the officer is rendered totally unfit for work or duty of any kind, enabling him to provide for himself, by an addition of another third of the average rate of active pay, so that an officer may, after 29 years' service, be invalided on a pension equivalent to his full active pay.

It is not possible to compute the strength of the retired list, as no data are available; the same with respect to the cost. No information can therefore be furnished on heads II. and IV., viz., the proportion of officers on the active and retired lists, and on the approximate cost of the active as compared with the retired list.

WILLIAM S. COOKE,
Captain 22nd Regiment,
D.A.Q.M.G.

FRANCE.

The system of promotion and retirement in the French army is that fixed by the law of 1832. This law will shortly be altered by a new law to be brought forward by a committee that has been engaged in the examination of the subject for some time. The law on promotion will be the fifth of the series of new laws introduced into the French army since the war of 1870.

In the French army the cadres of the regiments and staff are determined by law. The promotion is partly regimental, partly throughout the arm, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers; partly by seniority, and partly by selection.

The following are the rules as to promotion:—

1. No one is eligible for the rank of sub-lieutenant who does not fulfil the following conditions:—

(*a.*) Who is not 18 years of age.

(*b.*) Who has not served at least two years as a serjeant, or who has not been for two years at one of the military schools, or the Polytechnic school, and passed the examination.

Promotion from one grade to another can only take place after a service of at least two years as a sub-lieutenant, two years as a lieutenant, four years as a captain, three years as a major, chef de bataillon, or chef d'escadron, two years as a lieutenant-colonel; in the grades above that of colonel service of three years in each grade is required to qualify for promotion. Thus it is possible that a French officer *may* become a colonel in 13 years' service, and a general of brigade in 16 years.

But it may safely be assumed that such a thing has rarely or never happened.

One out of every three vacancies for sub-lieutenants is filled up by promotion from the ranks.

Two out of three of the vacancies in the ranks of lieutenant and captain are filled up by seniority, regimentally in the Infantry, Cavalry, and Staff Corps.* And from amongst the officers fit for promotion in the Artillery, and Engineers, the others by selection.

One out of two vacancies in the ranks of chef de bataillon, or chef d'escadron, are filled up by seniority in the arms Infantry, Cavalry, and Staff Corps, and amongst the captains eligible for promotion in the Artillery and Engineers. One out of two of the promotions to the rank of chef de bataillon or chef d'escadron, and all the promotions to the rank of major are filled up by selection.

All promotions above the rank of major or "chef" are by selection.

Any officer who for any reason, except reduction of his corps, suppression of his office, or absence on duty, ceases to be borne on the cadre of his regiment or corps ceases to count his time for seniority promotion.

* Promotion by seniority to a vacancy appears to be a *right* in France so far as the Infantry and Cavalry are concerned.

APP A. FRANCE.

No time spent by an officer in civil employment is allowed to count for promotion.

During war, or in the colonies, the period to be spent in each rank may also be reduced one half.

This period may also be reduced if an officer is mentioned in an order of the day, or if the step cannot otherwise be filled up.

If the army is serving in the field, one half only of the vacancies amongst the lieutenants and captains in place of two thirds are given by seniority, one half of those steps and all the vacancies in the rank of chef or major being filled by selection.

No promotion can take place to a rank if no place exists in the cadre of the army for the officer so promoted. No honorary rank can be given. No retired officer can be re-admitted into the army.

Looking to these rules it is evident that one of their consequences is that officers promoted from the ranks can seldom become field officers; in the Artillery or Engineers very rarely. There are thus really two streams of promotion in the French service running side by side apparently one, viz., a seniority promotion, which affects chiefly officers promoted from the ranks, and a selection promotion.

In comparing then the proportions of the various grades in the French army, the lower grades must really be reduced by nearly the whole of the officers promoted from the ranks, and hence the relative numbers of the different grades as affecting the promotion of the officers who come from the military schools is more favourable than at first sight it appears to be.

One consequence of this system is,—

The lower grades, sub-lieutenants, lieutenant, and captain, get clogged with men of middle or advanced age, who have served as non-commissioned officers, and who, remaining in the army with the view of obtaining better retirements, get continually passed over by others for the higher ranks. Those who watch French regiments have often been struck by the fact that the captains and sub-alterns appear in many cases to be older men than the field officer who commands them.*

Another point worthy of notice is the fact that prior to the rank of captain, all promotion is regimental; after that it is general in the arm of the service. As promotion in an army must be based to a great extent on the proportions of the various grades, the higher grades are increased in France as follows:—

A French regiment composed of three battalions has a staff composed of six field officers, five captains, and three lieutenants, in addition to the company officers, 21 captains, 21 lieutenants, 21 sub-lieutenants. The duties performed by the adjutant, quartermaster, and paymaster in the English army being performed by officers who are combatants, and borne on the strength of the army, thus increasing the number of officers in the higher grades.

In addition, officers who are appointed as professors in the various schools are chiefly taken from amongst the captains and majors, as are also officers employed in recruiting and remount duties, the number being about 100, which is really equivalent to an augmentation of that number in the higher ranks.

Vacancies in the French army can only occur from the ollowing causes:—

1. Deaths, dismissals, or resignations.
2. Appointment to some civil branch of the army, as the Intendance, or its subordinate branches.
3. Appointment to some civil post under the Government, or to a post making the officer supernumerary.
4. By superannuation on completion of a certain number of years' service in the various grades.
5. By retirements.

1. As regards the first, nothing need be said.

2. As regards the second, the Intendance is open to all officers who have attained the rank of captain. This body has some privileges and additional pay and allowances. Hence a certain number of captains are taken off each year by officers seeking the Intendance as a career, but the number must be limited; the corps numbering only 300 officers of all grades.* A considerable number of sub-lieutenants and lieutenants are taken off the list by the subordinate branches of the Intendance, namely:— FRANCE.

Administrative officers in Intendance offices	500
Commissaries of hospitals	325
Commissaries of subsistence	325
Clothing and equipment	80
Military justice	68
Total	1,298

The general effect of supplying these branches from the ranks of the army being to give openings for the junior officers, and thus to render the number seeking promotion in the combatant hierarchy less; in other words, to relatively diminish the number of subalterns and captains as compared with the number of field officers.

3. As regards the third, the number of appointments in the civil departments given to officers has hitherto been small.† Recent regulations have conferred on officers the right to obtain certain appointments, apparently in lieu of pension, but the regulations are new, and until they are worked up in the new law on promotion will produce little or no effect.

4. The number of vacancies obtained by superannuation is variable, as it is nearly optional.‡

The following, which is extracted from a report on the French army by Major Mansfield, gives clearly the French superannuation regulations:—

Pensions.—"The charge for retiring pensions falls upon the Department of Finance, and the annuities given to members and officers of the Legion of Honour, and the pensions of the military medal are provided out of funds specially devoted to those objects. It may, however, be as well to advert here to some of the regulations affecting the retiring pension which enable the state to discharge this part of its obligations at a very low rate. The law by which pensions are regulated was settled in 1831."

For long service.—"No officer or soldier can claim a pension under 30 years of effective service. In that case he obtains the minimum pension of his rank, if he has held it for at least two years, otherwise he can only claim the pension of the next inferior rank. For each additional year of service is granted a twentieth of the difference between the minimum and maximum rates. Service performed in a civil office which entitles the holder to a pension is counted for the retiring pension if an officer or soldier has 20 years of effective military service."

"The pupils of the École Polytechnique on being appointed officers are entitled to count four years of study as part of the effective service required. Service in the field or abroad is allowed to count for twice as much as the time actually spent in it. A campaign that lasts less than a year is counted as one year's service, so long as there is only one campaign within the twelve months."

"The maximum pension is gained by 50 years' service. Any officer, non-commissioned officer, corporal, or gendarme holding the same rank for 12 years receives an additional fifth, even though he be entitled to the maximum rate."

Wounds.—"Retiring pensions are granted in the case of wounds and diseases that are pronounced incurable, and which have been caused immediately by hurts received in active service or have been produced by the fatigues of a campaign. Wounds or diseases confer an immediate right to a pension, if they have caused,—blindness, amputation of two limbs, amputation of one limb, or absolute loss of the use of one or more limbs."

"No pensions are given to officers for wounds unless they are of such a nature as to render it impossible for him ever to return to his duties."

"Non-commissioned officers and rank and file receive no pension for wounds, unless so severe as to make it impossible for them to work for their living. There are no gratuities given in money for wounds, as in the case in our service, and no person of whatever rank, who remains in the service, is entitled to receive any pension on the score of wounds."

Widows and Orphans.—"Pensions are given to the widows and orphans of officers killed in action, or dead from the effects of disease contracted on service."

"Also to the widows and orphans of officers who at the time of decease have claims for a retiring pension, provided that the marriage has been contracted at least two years before death."

---

* The French military medal is granted only to soldiers or non-commissioned officers. An examination of the French Infantry Officers' Seniority List shows the following:—

Colonels	136.	No. having the military medal	0
Lieutenant-colonels	156.	" "	0
"Chefs de bataillon"	722.	" "	3
Captains	4,082.	" "	260
Lieutenants	3,327.	" "	367
Sub-lieutenants	3,732.	" "	458

Although these numbers can by no means be taken as showing the number of officers who have come from the ranks in each grade, yet they probably give a pretty fair approximation to the relative proportion of such officers in each grade.

* One promotion in five to each rank in the Intendance is generally given to officers of corresponding grades in the army, viz., major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and general of brigade.

† Chiefly in the colonial branch.

‡ Captains or lieutenants of 54 years of age may be compulsorily retired.

"Widows' pensions are fixed at one fourth of the highest rate of pension for the rank of the husband. However, the widows of field marshals receive a pension of 240*l.*"

"The widows of non-commissioned officers and soldiers never receive a pension of less than 4*l.* In the case of *separation de corps* the widow has no claim, but the rights of the orphans are not prejudiced. The relief given to orphan children of an officer, whatever their number, is the same in amount as the widow's pension. Neither widows nor orphans are entitled to any pension whatever, if the marriage has been contracted without leave of the military authorities."

Officers' marriage.—"Officers of all ranks and non-commissioned officers and men are forbidden to marry without special permission. In order to obtain leave, documents must be sent in, describing the family, character, and fortune of the party, duly certified by the mayor and sous-prefect of the district. Proof must also be given that the party possesses property to the amount of 48*l.* per annum on unexceptionable security."

"To non-commissioned officers and soldiers leave to marry is refused, except when there is a vacancy in a regiment for a vivandière or a washerwoman. Civil functionaries who marry officers or soldiers without the requisite permission of the authorities, are liable to dismissal from their offices."

The various rates of pensions will be seen in the following table:—

Ranks.	Retiring Pension for Length of Service.					Retiring Pension for great and incurable Wounds or Infirmities.										Pension to Widows, compassionate allowance to Orphans, ¼ of the highest pension granted for length of Service.
	Minimum at 30 Years' Service.	Annual Increment for each Year above 30 and for each Year, resulting from counting a Campaign.	Maximum at 50 Years' Service, Campaigns included.	Loss of two Limbs, or total loss of Sight, at any length of Service.	Loss of one Limb, or absolute loss of the use of two Limbs, at any length of Service.	Wounds and Infirmities, causing the Loss of the use of one Limb, or equivalent to it.			Wounds or Infirmities, which compel the Officer to leave the Service before he has completed 30 Years' Service.						
						Minimum.	Increment for each Year of Service, Campaigns included.	Maximum at 20 Years, Campaigns included.	Minimum.	Increment for each Year of Service beyond 30 Years' Service, when the Campaigns and the Service amount to 30 Years.	Maximum at 50 Years of Service, including Campaigns.			
	£ s.	£ s. d.	£ s.	£	£ s.	£ s.	£ s. d.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s. d.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s. d.	£ s.	
Lieut.-general, General of division.	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	240	240 0	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	60
Major-general	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	160	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	40
Colonel	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	120	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	30
Lieutenant-colonel	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	96	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	24
Chef de bataillon (major)	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	80	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	20
Captain	48 0	0 16 0	64 0	64	64 0	48 0	0 16 0	64 0	48 0	0 16 0	64 0	48 0	0 16 0	64 0	16
Lieutenant	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	48	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	12
Sub-lieutenant	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	40	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	10
Military intendant	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	160	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	40
Sub-intendant	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	120	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	30
Assistant sub-intendant	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	80	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	20
Surgeon-in-chief	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	144	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	36
Surgeon, principal	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	96	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	24
„ major	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	80	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	20
„ assistant major	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	48	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	12
„ sub-assistant major.	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	40	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	10
Administrator of hospital, principal administrative officer.	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	96	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	24
Administrator of hospitals, commissary.	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	80	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	20
Administrator of hospitals, assistant, 1st & 2nd class.	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	48	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	12
Administrator of hospital, sub-assistant.	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	40	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	24 0	0 16 0	40 0	10
Administrator of hospitals, hospital orderly.	10 0	0 6 0	16 0	A 18	16 0	10 0	0 6 0	16 0	10 0	0 6 0	16 0	10 0	0 6 0	16 0	4
Administrator of hospitals, hospital orderly, assistant.	8 16	0 4 9	13 12	B 16	13 12	8 16	0 4 9	13 12	8 16	0 4 9	13 12	8 16	0 4 9	13 12	D 4
1st class veterinary surgeon	16 0	0 8 0	24 0	24	24 0	16 0	0 6 0	24 0	16 0	0 6 0	24 0	16 0	0 6 0	24 0	6
2nd class „ „	12 0	0 8 0	20 0	20	20 0	12 0	0 6 0	20 0	12 0	0 6 0	20 0	12 0	0 6 0	20 0	5
Principal commissary	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	96	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	72 0	1 4 0	96 0	24
Assistant commissary	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	80	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	60 0	1 0 0	80 0	20
Commissary	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	48	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	12
Chief inspector (Revues)	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	240	240 0	160 0	4 0 0	240 0	240 0	4 0 0	240 0	240 0	4 0 0	240 0	60
Inspector	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	160	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	120 0	2 0 0	160 0	40
Sub-inspector	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	120	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	96 0	1 4 0	120 0	30
Assistant sub-inspector	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	72	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	18
Commissary (ordonnateur)	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	144	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	96 0	2 8 0	144 0	36
„ des Guerres	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	72	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	48 0	1 4 0	72 0	18
Assistant commissary	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	48	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	32 0	0 16 0	48 0	12

Legion of Honour.—"The only other emoluments to which the military profession have to look are the annuities of the Legion of Honour and the military medal. By the decree of 1852, the following scale was fixed for officers and men admitted to the order:—

	£	
Companions	10	per annum.
Officers	20	„
Commanders	40	„
Grand officers	80	„
Grand crosses	120	„

Military medal.—The military medal, also instituted in 1852, for non-commissioned officers and soldiers gives a pension of 4*l.* to those persons who obtain the decoration."

5. As regards retirement, the following are the regulations for general officers:—

There can be by law only six marshals in peace, and 12 in war. After war the number must be reduced to six by gradual absorption. At present there are only five marshals. General officers are promoted, independently of corps. Generals are divided into two classes, those who are on active service, or waiting for it. Of these, there are in peace, when the army is in its normal state—

Generals of division	80
„ brigade	160
Total	240

APP. A. FRANCE.

After 65 years of age, generals must pass from the active to the reserve list, except certain officers who may, by a special enactment, be retained on the active list.

There are now on the active list,—

Generals of division, over 65 years of age, specially retained on the active list,		
Employed - - -	5	
Unemployed - - -	12	
Total -	—	17
*Supernumerary,		
Employed - - -	1	
Unemployed - - -	1	
Total -	—	2
Generals of division,		
Employed - - -	82	
Unemployed - - -	19	
Total -	—	101
Total generals of division -		— 120
Generals of brigade,		
Employed - - -	176	
Unemployed - - -	25	
Total -	—	201
Total general officers on the active list		340†
In the reserve there are,		
Generals of division - -	74	
Generals of brigade - -	165	
Total -	—	239
Total general officers on both lists -		579

Any general of brigade who has not at 62 years of age become a general of division is passed into the reserve.

Any general of division who is 65 years of age is passed into the reserve.

But any general officer who has commanded-in-chief before an enemy an army composed of divisions of various arms, or the Artillery or Engineers in an army composed of several Army Corps, has the right to be kept off the reserve list to any age. The number at present is 17.

The number of officers in the French Army, arranged by the various arms of the service and ranks, is shown in Table A. The gendarmerie‡ and garrison staff, the latter now being suppressed, offer places for a great many old officers; the garrison staff was really a retirement, under another name, for a number of old officers. Officers are promoted by selection as follows:—General officers at their inspections receive reports from commanding officers naming the officers that they consider deserving of promotion. Each general prepares a list of the candidates he recommends for promotion, and the whole of these lists are submitted to the committees of the various arms. These committees consist entirely of general officers, who prepare a list for the arm they belong to. This list is submitted to the minister. Generally these lists overlap one another, that is to say, the number of names on each year's list are not worked off in the year, and consequently the lists become more lists of officers eligible for promotion than officers to be promoted. As a rule promotion runs by seniority on the list, although the minister may select any name on the list to fill any vacancy. Thus the promotion in the French army may generally be said to be a seniority promotion, the majority of the field officers being taken from amongst the officers coming from the schools, and the openings given to captains and subalterns who have come from the ranks to quit the service tending to place the higher and lower grades, as regards the former class of officers, more on an equality.

As an example of promotion by selection the following is taken from one number of the Moniteur de l'Armie.

Captains to be majors.

Captain A who stood 179th on the general list of Infantry captains.
„ B „ 250th „ „
„ C „ 416th „ „
„ D „ 238th „ „

Majors to be lieutenant-colonels.

Major E who stood 7th on the general list of Infantry majors.
„ F „ 57th „ „
„ G „ 68th „ „

Lieutenant-colonels to be colonels.

Lieut.-colonel H who stood 31st on the general list of Infantry lieut.-colonels.
„ I „ 50th „ „
„ K „ 52nd „ „
„ L „ 18th „ „
„ M „ 1st „ „
„ N „ 12th „ „

These promotions were to replace certain transfers, and the following colonels made generals as follows:—

Colonel O who stood 22nd on the general list of Infantry colonels.
„ P „ 13th „ „
„ Q „ 18th „ „

These officers promotion being determined by the order in which they stood on the lists prepared by the general officers at the inspections.

FRANCE.

A.

—	Colonels.	Lieut-colonels.	Majors.	Captains.	Lieutenants.	Sub-lieutenants.
Staff corps - -	35	43	116	300	43	—
Infantry - -	136	156	722	4,082	3,327	3,732
Cavalry - -	66	77	302	1,068	759	1,322
Artillery - -	63	72	286	830	655	216
Train - -	2	1	11	78	117	2
Engineers - -	36	33	150	353	121	65
Total - -	338	382	1,587	6,711	5,022	5,337
Gendarmerie - -	15	16	102	310	314	69
Garrison staff - -	14	10	27	109	25	3
Total - -	29	26	129	419	339	72
Grand Total - -	367	408	1,716	7,130	5,361	5,409

A recent article in the Bulletin de la Réunion des Officers, in which a discussion on the relative proportion of grades in the various arms of the service has been going on, states that the general officers in the French army come from the various arms in the following proportions:—

Staff -	1	general to	12	officers.
Engineers -	1	„	28	„
Cavalry -	1	„	60	„
Artillery -	1	„	72	„
Infantry -	1	„	84	„

But this statement is qualified by the following curious facts, which the French army list, however, affords no means of verifying, viz., that in the Infantry and Cavalry *two thirds* of the officers come from the ranks; in the Engineers *four-elevenths;* in the Artillery *three seventhis*.

Consequently, as officers from the ranks rarely or ever attain the higher grades, the foregoing table is corrected as follows:—

Staff -	1	general to	12	officers.
Engineers -	1	„	16	„
Cavalry -	1	„	20	„
Infantry -	1	„	28	„
Artillery -	1	„	41	„

This is given as representing the chances of an officer coming from the schools becoming a general.

A further curious statement is made, that in the Infantry and Cavalry the mass of the officers leave the arm of the service as captains. In the Engineers and Staff corps as major, and in the Artillery as lieutenant-colonels.

There is, however, no means available for checking these statements, assuming that they are correct; and the circumstances of the army, the dates of the officers' commissions, the rules for promotion, and the number of officers educated at the schools appear to confirm their accuracy, the relative proportions of grades in the four arms of the service, from which the chances of promotion for officers coming from the schools may be estimated, would be as follows:—

B.

—	Colonels.	Lt.-colonels.	Majors.	Captains.	Subalterns.
Staff Corps - - - -	35	43	116	300	43
Infantry - - - -	136	156	722	1,360	2,352
Cavalry - - - -	66	77	302	356	697
Artillery - - - -	63	32	286	468	496
Engineers - - - -	36	33	150	214	119

A proportion far more favourable than that shown on table A.

* The Duke de Nemours and the Duke d'Aumale.

† Unemployed "disponible." It has been proposed by the committee on Cadre to increase the normal number of generals from 240 to 300. It will be observed that out of the 340 generals on the active list 57 only are unemployed, 12 of whom are retained on the active list exceptionally for previous service.

‡ One promotion in five in each rank, captain, major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel in the gendarmerie, is given to officers of corresponding grades in the army.

The French army in its normal state, Army List of 1870, gives the following :—

——	Senior Captain.	Junior Captain.	Number of Years in Grade.
Staff Corps	January 1854	December 1869	15
Infantry	July 1854	January 1870	15½
Cavalry	May 1854	December 1869	14½
Artillery	February 1855	„ „	14
Engineers	February 1853	„ „	16

The officers and soldiers who are finally admitted to pension are borne on the general pension list of the state; the amount is given as a lump sum of 2,708,000*l.*,* and there is no means of determining how much of this is due to officer pensioners, and how much to soldier pensioners.

In addition to the general pension list, there are certain sums of the nature of pensions which are charged to the war estimates, and are as follows :—

Unemployed officers :	£
840 officers unemployed on account of some temporary infirmity	47,732
230 officers unemployed because their offices have been suppressed	848
Total	48,580

This pay is given to officers who are unemployed, because their corps has been reduced, their employment suppressed, having been made prisoners of war, or suffering from temporary infirmities. The amount is calculated on the net pay, all allowances being deducted, at half-pay for officers above the rank of lieutenant, at three-fifths pay for lieutenants and sub-lieutenants.

Officers whose appointment is suspended for a short time get only two fifths of their pay.

There is a further temporary retirement termed " solde de reforme."

It is given to officers who have less than 20 years' service, and it lasts for a period equal to one half the period served. It is equal to two thirds of the minimum rate of pension given on the pension table.

	£
There are 154 officers on this list, and the amount is	6,362
53 of these officers receive a certain small addition which amounts to	906
Total	7,268

There is also a compassionate allowance given as a permanent allowance in special cases :—

1. To old officers without pension or means of any kind.
2. To old soldiers, who have lost a limb or are blind, but have received no pension.
3. To widows and orphans of old officers and soldiers.
4. To widows and orphans of old officers in place of the Order of St. Louis.

A renewable pension is also granted to wounded officers and soldiers who have no claim on other funds. This pension is for two years only, and may be renewed if the pensioner is still unfit for work.

†The number of permanent pensioners in 1865 was	569
The number of temporary pensioners in 1865 was	20,338

Since that date the former class have slightly increased, the latter largely diminished. The numbers and amounts being,—

		£
Permanent pensions,	626	52,600
Temporary „	6,675	100,000
Total		152,600

There is also the Invalides, where 634 pensioners are maintained. The cost of this establishment, including a general of division as governor, and a staff of 68 persons, who may be looked on as pensioned, amounts to 42,157*l.*

The total pension list of the French army is therefore as follows :—

		£
Civil Estimates.	Amount of pensions to officers and soldiers pensioned under the provisions laid down, page 4	2,708,000
War Estimates.	Unemployed officers	48,580
	Solde de reforme (for officers only)	7,268
	Compassionate allowance for officers and soldiers	152,600
	The Invalides	42,157
	Total	2,958,605

The total cost of the regimental officers of the French army is as follows :—

		£	Per head. £
‡ Infantry,	12,716 officers of all grades,	1,617,477,	or 127
Cavalry	3,339 „ „	488,019,	or 146
Artillery,	3,275 „ „	516,250,	or 157
Engineers,	858 „ „	142,935,	or 166

These sums include the money pay and the money allowances in lieu of lodging, fuel, light, command pay, office allowances, and personal allowances, but do not include horses and servants. The average pay of all the officers of the French army, irrespective of arm of the service, would be 137*l.* The pay of all officers is reduced to about one fifth when they are in hospital or absent on leave. French officers, below the rank of field officers in all arms, are supplied with horses at the public cost, with clothes at a cheap rate, and have several minor advantages.§ On taking the field, officers receive a " gratification " equivalent to extraordinary field allowance.

	£
Marshal	480
General of division	320
General of brigade	160
Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, and Staff Corps :	
Colonel	72
Lieutenant-Colonel	48
Major	40
Captain	28
Lieutenant	20
Infantry :	
Colonel	48
Lieutenant-Colonel	40
Major	36
Captain	24
Lieutenant	16

The dates of the senior captains in each arm of the service in the French army are at present as follows :—

Infantry, August 1857.
Cavalry, January 1860.
Artillery, March 1859.
Engineers, March 1858.

None of these officers can be much under 25 years' service. Hence it may be assumed that a large proportion of of the majors of the French army are 30 years' service and upwards,‖ or that a large proportion of majors have earned their retirement. Comparing the retired pay granted at 30 years' service with the major's pay of each arm, it appears :—

		Retired pay £	£	
Infantry, major's pay,¶	196 ;	60,	or ·306	of the full pay.
Cavalry „	212 ;	„	·28	„
Artillery „	251 ;	„	·23	„
Engineers „	232 ;	„	·25	„

* This sum is not charged to army funds.

† There is a sum of 800*l.* a year for pensions to Mamelukes who came to France in 1802 still borne on the war estimates. This amount has however been deducted in the above calculation.

‡ These numbers are slightly different from those on table A., which gives the total number of officers. The numbers given here are those of officers belonging to French troops only.

§ Cheap travelling on railways, right of entrance to theatre and public places of amusement at a very reduced rate.

‖ Campaigns as provided for in the French regulations counting as service.

¶ Officers of this grade would probably be officers of the Legion of Honour or entitled to 20*l.* a year additional.

APP. A. — FRANCE.

These are the minimum rates; the maximum rate of retirement for majors is 80*l.* at 50 years' service, campaign included, or the proportion of retired to full pay would be,—

In the Infantry	·408
„ Cavalry	·37
„ Artillery	·31
„ Engineers	·34

In the colonel's rank the proportion would be:—

	£	Retired pay, min. £	Proportion.	Max. £	Porportion.
Infantry,	302	96	·32	120	·38.
Cavalry,	326	„	·29	„	·37.
Artillery,	362	„	·27	„	·33.
Engineers,	358	„	·28	„	·33.

In general terms, the retired pay is about one third the full pay, lodging money being included with the full pay.

Pay of Officers.—Staff.

—	Out of Paris.	In Paris.	Unemployed. First 6 Months.	Unemployed. After 6 Months.
	£	£	£	£
Marshal	1,200	—	—	—
General of division	791	828	791	396
General of brigade	528	552	528	264
Colonel	340	405	340	169
Lieutenant-colonel	273	338	273	135
Major	233	290	233	116
1st captain	142	179	142	71
2nd captain	126	179	126	63

All these officers receive additional pay in the shape of command pay, and pay for office expenses. These sums vary much.

The following give some of the amounts:—

	£
Marshal commanding Versailles army	1,600
Governor of Paris	1,280
Commandant of Army Corps	576
„ 1st class division	432
„ 2nd class division	332
„ Artillery or Engineers	280
„ a brigade	116
Chief of the staff of a corps	192
„ „ division	80
Majors or captains, from	72 to 5

Pay of

—	Cavalry. Out of Paris.	Cavalry. In Paris.	Infantry. Out of Paris.	Infantry. In Paris.
	£	£	£	£
Colonel	326	393	302	369
Lieutenant-colonel	250	309	231	288
Major	212	265	196	244
1st captain	138	175	130	166
2nd captain	122	163	118	154
1st lieutenant	99	133	91	123
2nd lieutenant	95	129	87	119
Sub-lieutenant	91	123	83	115

The following allowances are made to commanding officers:—

	£
Colonel commanding an Infantry regiment	84
„ „ Cavalry „	69
„ „ Field artillery regiment	80
„ „ Horse „ „	69
„ „ Engineer regiment	80

Allowances of 12*l.* to 6*l.* a year are also given to the regimental staff in each arm.

Staff.—Pay of Intendance.

—	Out of Paris.	In Paris.	Unemployed. First 6 Months.	Unemployed. After 6 Months.
	£	£	£	£
Intendant-general	792	830	792	396
Intendant	528	552	528	264
Sub-intendant, 1st class	338	405	338	161
„ 2nd „	278	345	278	136
Assistant, 1st class	223	290	233	116
„ 2nd „	142	179	142	71
Chief administrative officer	213	263	—	—
Administrative officer, 1st class.	126	162	—	—
Administrative officer, 2nd class.	114	150	—	—
Assistant, 1st class	92	123	—	—
„ 2nd „	83	112	—	—

These officers receive additional pay as charge and office pay. 440*l.* for an Intendant general in chief, and 192*l.* for an Army Corps Intendant, and smaller sums for inferior grades.

Artillery Staff.

—	Out of Paris.	In Paris.	Unemployed. 6 Months.	Unemployed. After 6 Months.
	£	£	£	£
Colonel	338	405	338	169
Lieutenant-colonel	273	338	273	136
Major	233	290	233	116
Captain	142	179	142	71

These officers receive extra pay, the colonels from 96*l.* to 64*l.*, the others from 40*l.* to 24*l.*

Engineer Staff.

—	Out of Paris.	In Paris.	Unemployed. 6 Months.	Unemployed. After 6 Months.
	£	£	£	£
Colonel	338	405	338	169
Lieutenant-colonel	273	338	273	136
Major	233	290	233	116
1st captain	142	179	142	71
2nd „	126	163	126	63
Lieutenant	104	144	104	52

These officers receive extra pay, the colonels from 96*l.* to 64*l.*, the others from 60*l.* to 24*l.*

—	Artillery Regiments. Out of Paris.	Artillery Regiments. In Paris.	Engineer Regiments. Out of Paris.	Engineer Regiments. In Paris.
	£	£	£	£
Colonel	362	429	358	405
Lieutenant-colonel	297	362	273	338
Major	251	308	232	290
1st captain	150	190	142	179
2nd „	134	174	122	163
1st lieutenant	107	142	99	133
2nd „	103	138	95	129

All the above amounts include lodging money, but nothing else.

R. HOME, Lieut.-Col.,
D.A.Q.M.G.

FRANCE.

GERMANY.

PROMOTION.

The system of promotion in the German army is, *as a rule*, by seniority, butexceptions to this rule are made in the cases of those officers who have distinguished themselves in the field, or are otherwise deemed to have special qualifications for more rapid advancement.

Up to the rank of captain the rule of seniority is very generally observed, but in filling vacancies in the higher grades a wide discretion is exercised, and only those are promoted who, from their ability, capacity for command, and bodily vigour, are in every respect fitted for the more responsible duties.

This process of rather wide selection produces the requisite flow of promotion, by which men at a comparatively early age attain the different grades of field officer. An officer who, for instance, as senior of his rank among the captains, finds himself passed over once or twice usually takes the hint and retires from the service. The weeding process is repeated in all the subsequent grades, as an officer while in command of a battalion may have proved himself unfitted to command a brigade, or have become too corpulent to ride a horse, or when his time arrives for the command of a division his eye-sight or possibly his judgment may show signs of failing with his declining years.

In deciding upon an officer's fitness for advancement the interests of the service are alone consulted.

Staff Promotion.—Officers of the general staff and officers holding the appointments of adjutants on the staff of the Imperial House, receive exceptionally quick promotion.

Regimental Promotion.—The promotion of regimental officers up to captain takes place as a rule by seniority in the different corps (regiments in the Cavalry, Infantry, and Artillery, battalions in the Rifles, and in the whole corps in the case of the Engineers); but in order to preserve an equality of promotion, as far as possible, throughout the service, the seniors of other corps may be brought in to fill vacancies in the case of a corps in which an abnormal number has occurred.

The promotion to major in the case of the Infantry also takes place in the regiment but with many exceptions. In the case of the Rifles, Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, and Train, it takes place in the whole arm. Promotion to lieutenant-colonel and colonel is also mostly regulated by seniority and throughout the arm.

The following table gives the dates of the commissions of the senior colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and majors in the different arms:—

EXTRACT from ARMY LIST of 1873.

Rank.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Artillery.	Engineers.	Train.
Colonel	21st June 1867	16th Mar. 1869	26th July 1870	26th July 1870	26th July 1870
Lieutenant-colonel	18th Jan. 1872	18th Aug. 1871	18th Jan. 1872	18th Jan. 1872	18th Jan. 1872
Major	16th Feb. 1869	5th Mar. 1869	16th Mar. 1869	4th May 1869	16th Mar. 1869

It should be remarked in explanation of the above table, that, where the dates differ very much in the same rank, it is due to accidental circumstances. The Prussian system is to equalise the promotion as much as possible among the different arms, so that no one may have an advantage over the other.

PENSION.

Classification of Officers not actively employed.

The rules of obligatory service, which obtain for the men, apply also to the commissioned ranks of the German army. Every officer is as a rule bound to complete his three years' service with the colours. If he then obtains permission to quit active service, with the liability of being called upon to serve in the event of war, he is classed for the next four years in the category of the reserve, and for the succeeding five years he is borne on the rolls of the Landwehr.

Reserve and Landwehr officers are said to be "on furlough" (beurlaubten); the officers who belong to this category are intended to fill up the vacancies in the standing army in the event of augmentation or war. In peace the officers of the reserve are only called up for drills or manœuvres; officers of the Landwehr for landwehr manœuvres only.

Besides the officers on the "furlough list" there are the officers on the "unattached" list (zur Disposition), and officers "permanently retired" (ausser Dienst). The former are available for further service, but the latter are not, except with their own consent. In the campaign of 1870–71 many officers, however, of the latter category volunteered for active service.

Pension Rules.

Every officer on the active list is entitled to a life pension provided that, after not less than 10 years' service, he be unable to perform active military duty. In the event of an officer sustaining a wound or injury in the legitimate exercise of his duty, the above minimum limit of service is removed.

Should an officer become unfit for service before the expiration of 10 years, and be allowed in consequence to retire, or to be placed "at disposition," he may, if destitute, be granted a pension for a term of years or for life.

The amount of pension is regulated by the length of service and the "service income" of the rank held by the officer, provided he has held that rank for at least one year. This limiting period is removed if the cause of pensioning be an injury received on duty.

Officers of the Reserve and Landwehr acquire a right to pension by wounds or injury in the exercise of their military duty, but have no claim on the grounds of length of service.

Amount of Pension.

The pension, after completion of 10 years' service, amounts to $\frac{20}{80}$ of the "service income," and increases by $\frac{1}{80}$ for every successive year.

No pension, however, is to exceed in the aggregate $\frac{60}{80}$ of the "service income."

The pension in the case of an officer of less than 10 years' service, but who is invalided on account of an injury, amounts to $\frac{20}{80}$ of the "service income"; in the case of a destitute officer referred to in a preceding paragraph it is not to exceed $\frac{20}{80}$ of the "service income."

The "service income" is taken to include:—

(1.) The regimental pay.
(2.) Lodging money.
(3.) Service allowance in the case of brigade commanders upwards.
(4.) Compensation for servant in the case of officers of and below the rank of captain of the 1st class.
(5.) For 1st and 2nd lieutenants, their claim to a share of the regulation table money.
(6.) For captains of the 3rd class, 1st and 2nd lieutenants, the value of their claim to hospital treatment during sickness.

In cases where the "service income" exceeds 600*l.*, only half the sum in excess is to be taken into consideration in calculating the pension.

The accompanying table gives the amounts of pension of the different grades calculated for 10 years' service and upwards. For shortness the calculation has been made for subsequent periods of five years; the pension for any intermediate number of years can be obtained by interpolation.

APP. A. GERMANY.

TABLE showing the AMOUNTS of PENSION for the different GRADES of the COMMISSIONED RANKS. GERMANY

RANK.	Annual amount of Service Income.	Amount of Pension according to years.								
		10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50
		20/80	25/80	30/80	35/80	40/80	45/80	50/80	55/80	60/80
	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
1. Commander of an Army Corps -	1,099 10	274 10	344 0	413 10	481 0	550 10	619 0	687 0	756 0	825 0
2. (*a.*) Chief of the general staff of the army - - - - (*b.*) Inspector-general of Artillery - (*c.*) Chief of Engineer Corps -	949 10	237 10	297 0	356 5	415 10	474 15	534 0	593 5	653 0	712 10
3. Inspector-general of military education.	799 10	200 0	250 0	300 0	350 0	400 0	450 0	500 0	550 0	600 0
4. Commander of a division as lieut.-general.	751 8	188 0	233 10	282 0	329 0	376 0	423 0	469 10	516 10	563 10
5. Commander of a division as major-general.	676 8	169 10	211 10	253 10	295 10	337 10	379 10	423 0	465 0	507 0
6. Lieutenant-General with the pay of his rank but without command pay.	638 18	160 0	202 10	240 0	280 0	319 10	359 0	399 10	439 10	479 0
7. Commander of a brigade as major-general.	558 0	139 10	174 15	209 0	244 10	279 0	314 0	349 0	384 0	418 10
8. Major-general with the pay of his rank but without command pay.	513 0	128 10	163 10	194 0	225 0	256 10	288 15	321 0	352 10	384 15
9. Commander of a brigade as colonel -	498 0	124 10	156 0	187 0	218 0	249 0	280 10	311 5	342 10	373 10
10. Field officer commanding a regiment	433 5	108 0	135 10	162 10	191 5	216 10	244 0	271 0	298 0	325 0
11. Field officer commanding a battalion	302 0	75 10	94 10	113 10	132 0	151 0	170 0	189 0	208 0	227 0
12. Captain of Infantry or Cavalry. 1st. class.	227 0	57 0	71 0	85 10	99 10	113 10	127 10	142 0	156 0	170 10
13. Captain of Infantry or Cavalry. 2nd class.	137 0	34 10	43 0	51 10	60 0	68 10	77 0	85 10	94 10	103 0
14. Captain. 3rd class - - -	113 10	29 0	36 0	43 10	51 0	58 0	65 10	73 0	80 0	87 0
15. 1st lieutenant - - -	94 0	23 15	29 15	35 10	41 10	47 5	53 5	59 0	65 5	71 5
16. 2nd lieutenant - - -	85 10	21 10	27 0	32 5	37 10	43 0	48 5	53 10	59 0	64 10

Note.—These amounts are not correct to shillings.

Claims to Increase of Pension.

Every officer who has been invalided from active service in the field and becomes incapable of further military duty receives an increase to his ordinary pension as follows:—

(*a.*) If it is less than 82*l.* 10*s.* an increase of 37*l.* 10*s.*
(*b.*) If it is between 82*l.* 10*s.* and 90*l.*, it is made up to 120*l.*
(*c.*) If between 90*l.* and 120*l.*, an increase of 30*l.*
(*d.*) If it is between 120*l.* and 135*l.*, it is made up to 150*l.*
(*e.*) If it amounts to 135*l.* and upwards, an increase of 15*l.*

In addition to the pension and increased pension every officer is entitled to an allowance for the loss of a limb, eye, or other severe wound sustained in the execution of his duty; but the increase to his pension on this account is not to exceed 60*l.* per annum, except in cases where such injuries have been received on active service in the field.

These increases of pension are granted even if the cumulative amount causes the pension to exceed the "service income."

Calculation of Length of Service.

Service counts from the date of entry into the service to the date of retirement or of placing "at disposition."

No service can be counted before the commencement of the 18th year of age, except in time of mobilisation or war.

Each year passed on active service in the field counts for two in calculating pension.

Officers who claim their pension and have not yet completed their 60th year of age, are obliged to give proofs of their being unfitted for service. Those who have completed their 60th year can claim their pension unconditionally.

Proportion of Officers on the Active list and Retired list.

According to the German Estimates of the year 1873 the number of combatant officers on active employ in the Prussian army was approximately 13,180. The number of officers on the pension list inclusive of the invalids of the War of 1870–71 was 6,192; but without the invalids of the war, this number was 4,986. These numbers are for Prussia alone; they do not include the pensioners of the South German States, and are for combatant officers only.

Cost of Active list compared with Retired list.

In consequence of the mode in which the German Estimates are arranged, it is impossible to compute the cost of the active list.

The total cost of the pension list for the Prussian army, combatants only, is 641,124*l.* for the 6,192 pensioners above mentioned. Of these pensioners, 4,986 are paid from the ordinary pension fund (495,863*l.*); and the remaining 1,206, the invalids of the 1870–71 campaign, from the "Imperial Military Pension Fund" (145,262*l.*). This latter is a special fund, consisting of a portion of the war indemnity set aside for the purpose, the interest of which and part of the capital is annually disbursed in pensions to those invalided in the war.

F. C. H. CLARKE, Capt. R.A.,
D.A.Q.M.G.

HOLLAND.

HOLLAND.

The system of promotion in the Dutch Army is that of seniority, modified by selection.

In the subaltern grades, inclusive of that of captain, $\frac{5}{8}$ths of the vacancies are allotted by seniority and $\frac{3}{8}$ to selected candidates. This is the law on the subject, but, except in the case mentioned below, it is very unusual for promotion to take place in these grades otherwise than by seniority.

The proportion of promotions by selection is reserved as a general rule for those who qualify at the staff school. The fact of a lieutenant having passed through the staff school gives him the *right* of promotion by selection. He returns to his own arm as a captain. If he has attained that grade by seniority during his four years' course at the staff school, he may be afterwards proposed for the rank of major by selection.

The promotion throughout the Army to major and upwards is also by selection, although, as a general rule, every captain who has fair capacities for a higher command is promoted according to seniority on the occurrence of a vacancy. Promotion by selection is used sparingly.

Still it is not an infrequent occurrence for an officer to be passed over for promotion in the field officers grades. It takes place most commonly among the captains who stand highest on the list for promotion to major, because an officer may be a good captain but unfitted for the

HOLLAND.

command of a battalion, which is held in Holland by a major.

Officers who are not likely to make efficient commanders of battalions or regiments are generally given appointments on the local or provincial staffs (Plaatselijke kommandanten en adjudanten), but as these appointments are of a responsible nature such officers must have exhibited fitness for them.

Staff officers get exceptional advancement and attain higher rank sooner than their contemporaries serving with the troops. The reason for this is two-fold, (1) because they attain the grade of captain sooner by passing through the staff school, and (2) because in the higher ranks they leave the staff to get a command, generally with a step of rank.

Promotion to field rank always takes place throughout the arm, and therefore very rarely in the regiment.

To obtain the right to a captaincy an officer must serve eight years as a lieutenant in time of peace; in time of war a service of four years, or even less, qualifies, if he has particularly distinguished himself.

Field and general officers must serve two years in a grade before they can receive another step of rank.

The rate of promotion in the Dutch service is very much slower than in England. The following table gives the relative seniority of the senior field officers and captains in the different arms. Promotion is slowest in the Ordnance Corps and approximately equal in the Cavalry and Infantry.

ARMY LIST for 1873.

—	Infantry.		Cavalry.		Artillery.		Engineers.	
	Date of Commission as such.	Age on attaining Grade.	Date of Commission as such.	Age on attaining Grade.	Date of Commission as such.	Age on attaining Grade.	Date of Commission as such.	Age on attaining Grade.
Senior Colonel -	4th April 1870 -	55	8th September 1869	55	26th March 1871 -	61	4th April 1870 -	6
Senior Lieutenant-Colonel - -	18th March 1871 -	54	26th June 1870 -	55	18th March 1871 -	57	29th September 1868	57
Senior Major - -	5th February 1868	46	15th August 1868 -	50	28th February 1868	47	29th September 1868	53
Senior Captain -	16th September 1860	41	9th May 1863 -	37	19th January 1861	40	5th August 1853 -	42

Pensions.

The pensions vary in the Dutch Army according to the length of service. The rules of retirement are as follows:—

I. Every officer has the right to claim his retirement with pension.

(*a.*) When 55 years of age and at the same time with a service of 40 years.

(*b.*) When mentally or physically unfit for further service by disease or infirmity contracted on active service.

II. Every officer *is liable* to be pensioned even against his wish.

(*c.*) After 40 years' service, and being 55 years of age or less.

(*d.*) When 55 years of age, but less than 40 years' service.

(*e.*) When unfit for active service (as in I. *b*).

(*f.*) When mentally or physically unfit for active duty but with at least 30 years' service.

(*g.*) When mentally or physically unfit from disease or injury not contracted on active service, there being no fault on the part of the officer.

The *full* pensions are as follows:—

	£
Lieutenant-general - - -	250 yearly
Major-General - - -	200 „
Colonel - - - - -	150 „
Lieutenant-colonel - -	125 „
Major - - - -	109 „
Captain - - -	75 „
1st Lieutenant - - -	50 „
2nd Lieutenant - - -	42 „

Those who are pensioned according to (*a*), (*b*), (*d*), and (*e*) receive the full pension, but those included under (*c*), (*f*), and (*g*) receive for every year's service $\frac{1}{40}$th part of the full pension, but at least an amount equivalent to half the full pension. The loss of a limb, or of the full use of it, entitles an officer to a quarter more than the ordinary or full pension, the loss of two limbs or of both eyes to one half more than the full pension.

Every year's service in the colonies entitles an officer to an increase of 2*l.* 2*s.* to his pension.

Service commences to count for pension on completion of the 18th year of age, whether officer or not.

The rates of pay are given on the subjoined list and are exclusive of all allowances (lodging money, &c.).

RATES OF PAY exclusive of all ALLOWANCES.

—	Staff.	Infantry.	Cavalry and Horse Artillery.	Field Artillery.	Garrison Artillery and Engineers.
	£	£	£	£	£
Major-general -	460	460	460	460	460
Colonel - - -	375	333	375	375	375
Lieutenant-colonel	283	250	283	283	283
Major - - -	250	220	250	250	250
Captain, 1st class -	200	150	200	192	183
„ 2nd class	175	133	175	166	158
„ 3rd class	—	116	150	142	133
1st Lieutenant -	—	83	117	100	92
2nd Lieutenant -	—	75	100	83	75

Proportion of officers on the active list and on the retired list. Cost of active list compared with retired list.

The number of combatant officers on the active list in 1874 was 1,897, that of the retired list 811.

RANK.	Number of Officers on	
	Active list.	Pensioned list.
Lieutenant-generals - -	1	15
Major-generals - -	13	43
Colonels - - -	28	59
Lieutenant-colonels - -	52	94
Majors - - -	112	157
Captains - - -	556	320
1st Lieutenants - -	686	105
2nd Lieutenants - -	449	18

The cost of the active list is about 250,000*l.*, that of the retired list 123,000*l.*

These figures are for the European Army only.

F. C. H. CLARKE,
Capt. R.A., D.A.Q.M.G.

APP. A. ITALY. ITALY.

ITALY.

The whole state of promotion in the Italian army is at present in a confused and unsatisfactory state, owing to the events that have taken place during the last 20 years.

The list of the old armies of Naples, Piedmont, Tuscany, &c. had to be absorbed, and the great development given to the Piedmontese army in 1859, and to the Italian army in 1866, the subsequent reductions to a peace establishment, the modification of the Italian battalion from the French to the German formation, united to the large number of volunteer officers having claims of a certain nature on the government for military employment, have not only produced confusion but also accelerated promotion in 1866, and produced a subsequent stagnation. The question how a healthy rate of promotion is to be introduced has caused much discussion in Italy. A very able semi-official paper on this subject was published in the Revista Militaire in January 1873, by Captain Sismondo, professor at the superior war school. This paper deals with the subject in a clear manner, and was reviewed in the French Revue Militaire. The following has been compiled partly from Sismondo's paper, partly from the comments of the French reviewer.

The Piedmontese army, the regulations of which were based on those of the French army, forms the basis of the whole Italian military system.

The law on promotion of the 13th November 1853 and the regulations of the 5th June 1854 are almost identical with the French laws on the same subject; there are however differences which appear to be in favour of the Italian army.

Up to the year 1815 promotion in the Piedmontese army was entirely by seniority.

The regulations of 1815 introduced selection for the ranks of lieut.-colonel, colonel, and general.

The regulations of 1820 extended this to the rank of major, so that at that date legally all promotions below the rank of major were by seniority, the rank of major and all above being given by selection. The traditions of the army, however, still with few exceptions caused seniority promotion to be adhered to, the law being put in force only to stop the promotion of officers notoriously unfit for promotion, promotions in all cases being regimental.

The regulations of 1847 altered this state of affairs.

By these regulations promotion in the cavalry and infantry took place throughout the whole arm, and not by regiments. Further, one third of the promotions to the rank of captain, one half of those to the rank of major, all the promotions to the rank of colonel, and one fourth of those to the rank of major-general were given by selection, the remainder by seniority.

The events which took place in 1848 and 1849, when Piedmont engaged in a struggle with Austria, produced considerable changes, and several exceptional measures, and also infused new ideas into the army. On the 1st May 1851 General La Marmora brought a bill before the chamber, but it did not pass until 1853. This bill is what now with very few modifications governs promotion in the army. The chief provisions are as follows:—

No person can be promoted who is not acknowledged to be fit for the duties of his new office.

No person can become a sub-lieutenant who has not served for two years as a non-commissioned officer in the army, or satisfactorily passed the examinations at a military school.

One third of the vacancies amongst sub-lieutenants are given to non-commissioned officers.

In the artillery and engineers vacancies that cannot be so given are given to sub-lieutenants of other arms of the service who wish for them, and can pass the requisite examinations.

In the Train no officers come from the schools, the whole of the promotion is given to non-commissioned officers of the artillery and cavalry, or to sub-lieutenants of other arms. In the carabinieri the whole of the promotion is given to the sergeant-majors. In the engineer staff all vacancies are reserved for cadets from the schools.

So long as there are officers in waiting two thirds of the vacancies are given to them, the remaining one-third is divided into three parts, one being given to the non-commissioned officers, and two to the schools.*

One of the questions that a law on promotion must consider is the time requisite to pass from one grade to another.†

On the one hand an officer must have time to acquire in each rank the knowledge and aptitude requisite for the higher grade.

On the other hand, the career should be such as to allow men of merit to reach the higher grades at an age when in addition to scientific knowledge, physical force, energy, and power of command may be joined.

The Italian law lays down the following periods:—

2	years	in the	rank of	sub-lieutenant.
2	„	„	„	lieutenant.
4	„	„	„	captain.
3	„	„	„	major.
2	„	„	„	lieut.-colonel.
3	„	„	„	colonel.

These periods may be reduced in the field, either on account of some action meriting notice in an order of the day, or because the step cannot otherwise be filled.

Thus an officer gazetted to be a lieutenant at 20 years of age *may* become a major-general at 36.

But as no officer can by Italian law be promoted for whom there is no employment the promotion must depend essentially on the relative number of the officers in the various ranks composing the military hierarchy.

Sismondo gives the following table of the relative number of officers in each grade in the French, German, and Italian armies, using the army lists of 1870, 1868, and 1871 for the various countries respectively.

TABLE showing percentage of FIELD OFFICERS, CAPTAINS, and SUBALTERNS in the FRENCH, ITALIAN, and GERMAN ARMIES.

Arms of the Service.	Field Officers.			Captains.			Subalterns.		
	Italy.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	France.	Germany.
Infantry	6·36	7·24	11·31	22·25	36·08	21·18	71·39	56·68	67·51
Cavalry	9·99	13·07	14·17	18·08	34·07	21·21	71·93	52·86	64·62
Artillery	11·08	19·84	11·24	28·60	42·35	26·84	60·32	37·81	61·92
Engineers	13·73	24·16	18·11	36·49	52·20	22·19	49·78	23·64	59·70

By the Italian Army List of 1873 the proportions appear altered to the following* :—

—	Field Officers.	Captains.	Subalterns.
Infantry	10·37	22·93	66·68
Cavalry	12·39	21·69	65·92
Artillery	11·63	31·75	56·57
Engineers	14·23	42·99	42·78

It follows from the small number of field officers compared with company officers that the normal promotion is very slow, particularly in the infantry. And it is only the very exceptional circumstances of the last 15 years that have given the Italian army general officers of from 35 to 40 years of age.

* French reviewer.

Sismondo shows the existing state of affairs by the following table, where the figures show the average number of years' service in each rank, and the total service in the cavalry and infantry at three epochs.‡

—	1858.		1865.		1871.	
	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Captains	9	9	5	5	10	11
Subalterns	14	18	9	10	17	18
Total	23	27	14	15	27	29

* Officers in waiting "aspettativa" are those who are unemployed on account of reduction in the army.

† These remarks from the French reviewer.

‡ Sismondo.

The result of the large augmentations made in 1865, to meet the war of 1866 and the subsequent reductions are well shown by the complete stagnation of promotion that followed.

*Chapter 2 of the law of 1853 deals with two questions. Should promotion be by the arm of the service? or regimentally? should it be by seniority? or by selection? or by both?

Regimental promotion has the great advantage of keeping the officer when promoted in the same regiment. He thus profits by the knowledge he has of his own subordinates, and in their eyes he must have more consideration, more authority, and they must like him the more from their prévious knowledge of him, "esprit de corps" is much strengthened amongst the permanent members of the same military family.

On the other hand promotion by the arm equalises more nearly the chances of every one, it avoids the great inconvenience of discouraging old officers in one regiment by putting their juniors in a more fortunate regiment over their heads, "esprit d'arme" may thus replace "esprit de corps" in a small army as the old Piedmontese army was.

In a large army, however, selection if it is admitted is very difficult to exercise over all the lower grades of officers in the same arm, the services of most are of a nature such as rarely to give a preference, and it is impossible to compare fitness and capacity so that a proper classification of candidates can be prepared.

The law of 1853 laid down that in the infantry and cavalry promotion of sub-lieutenants and lieutenants should at all times be regimental, and in war time the promotions to the rank of captain should be also regimental, all others should be by the arm of the service (excepting certain steps given to the staff). In 1854 this was, however, altered, and one third of the sub-lieutenants vacancies were given to the arm *generally*, promotion to the rank of lieutenant being given by the arm in peace, regimental promotion being reserved entirely for war.

The law of 1855 removed these distinctions, and *all promotion has since that date been by the arm of the service, not regimentally.*

Notwithstanding the immense augmentation of the Italian Army since 1855, this law still exists, some of the difficulties as regards selection have been partly obviated. But those referred to as arising from a want of "esprit de corps" still subsist.

The following are deemed distinct arms :—

The Royal Carabineers.
The Infantry, including the line, the Bersiglieri, the Military Districts, and the Hospital corps.
The Cavalry and the Cavalry schools.
The Royal Artillery and train.
The Royal Engineers and train.
The Royal Staff corps.

The Staff corps in Italy is at present considered as a school for forming general officers, it is open to all arms of the service, and to all ranks. Two-thirds of the vacancies for captains are given to the lieutenants of the corps, one-third to captains from all branches of the army, all promotions to the rank of lieutenant-colonel are reserved for the corps. All other steps of any kind are given to the army generally, whether the officers have or have not previously served on the staff.

The general condition being that they must have passed successfully through the War School. As regards artillery or engineer officers proposed for the rank of major, or lieutenant-colonels of all arms for the rank of colonel, fitness for the position only is looked to.

Staff officers further are classed for promotion *by selection* to the ranks of major, lieutenant-colonel, or colonel in the arms from which they have orginally come.

In General Marmora's report on the law of 1853 the following occurs :—

"Promotion by seniority is undeniably the best for excluding improper influences, for maintaining concord in the army, for suppressing individual rivalry, consolidating military institutions, and assuring to every one a certain and determinate career."

"But far from stimulating activity and emulation it appears to extinguish all zeal and ardour, and it places in the highest positions men who in subordinate grades have consumed their energy and strength, who with age have lost vigour and promptitude, qualities essentially requisite at all the steps of the military hierarchy. Considerations such as these, which undoubtedly weigh much in favour of selection, must not cause us to forget that time spent in the service of the country *is a claim*, and should prevent us from destroying the humble expectations of willing men who, although they have not distinguished qualities, yet are not without their merits."

These principles were embodied in the law of 1853. Altered as has been said by the subsequent law of 1855, but in practice promotion has been by seniority in the lower grades, where it is difficult for the authorities to know the officers well, and where it is desirable that they should have time to show their qualities, a few steps being, however, reserved for selection.

The rank of captain is in practice given, in peace, two-thirds by seniority, one third by selection.

The rank of major is given, in peace, one-half by selection, one-half by seniority; in war, all by selection.

Above this rank all promotion is by selection. In these arrangements a strong likeness to the French system will be observed. But as the French reviewer remarks, in the application of the law there are safeguards against incompetency in Italy which do not exist in France.

The Italian law *clearly lays down that fitness is essential for promotion;* the law does not detail what fitness is, or how fitness is to be ascertained, and the various war ministers have from time to time taken the requisite steps to lay down rules on this head.

It should be remarked, says the French reviewer, that one great difference between the French and Italian law is *seniority in Italy confers no right to promotion; in France it does.* In Italy although an officer may be the senior, and a vacancy may occur, it by no means follows that this officer must be promoted. He must be fit, and this is determined partly by his record of service, partly by trial and examination. A captain may be an excellent captain and yet have neither the knowledge nor authority requisite to command a larger force.

For the step from sub-lieutenant to lieutenant the same knowledge that an officer prior to appointment possessed is sufficient, but the posts of captain and major are different, and it must be proved by a strict examination that the candidate is really fit. Consequently seniority as shown by the army list is not the seniority that determines the steps given by what is termed *seniority*. Lists for seniority promotion are drawn up for each rank up to that of major, as well as lists for promotion by selection.

The difference between the French and Italian laws being chiefly in their application, it is desirable to follow the French reviewer, and give a sketch of his description of the way in which the Italian law is put in operation.

Officers are promoted by Royal decree on the recommendation of the minister for war, acting on the faith of lists prepared annually as follows :—

By the regulations of 1868 a record of service (Specchio caratteristico) is drawn up for all company officers and for all field officers who are not commanding officers of Regiments. As regards commanding officers, the general officer under whom they are serving sends in each year a detailed account of their qualities as subordinates and commanders, their fitness physically, intellectually, or morally, and their military capacity.

The triennial records of service are prepared as follows: —A committee under the presidency of the commanding officer or head of department, and composed of all the officers of the corps or department senior in grade to the officer to be reported on who are present at head quarters.

Captains are only taken from the battalion of infantry, brigade* of artillery or engineers, to which the officer belongs. Captains are, however, only allowed to give their opinions, having no vote.

Several field officers junior to the president are also appointed as special members.

Lieutenants are never allowed to be members of these committees.

Decisions are always given by the majority of votes, the opinions and the reasons for each vote being given; any discussion that takes place is taken down in writing, and signed by all the members who have votes. Two copies of this document are prepared; one remains with the corps,

* The whole of the following is from the French reviewer.

* This word denotes two or more companies or batteries under one command.

and is laid before the inspector-general; the other is sent through the general commanding to the minister.

The "records of service" are all drawn up on one form; after giving the service of the officer, a very detailed statement under separate headings is given of his physical, intellectual, and moral qualities; his military moral qualities, (authority, courage, discipline, love of his profession, devotion to his country, the esteem and affection in which he is held by his equals, his inferiors, and superiors), the nature of his general education, and his military education; his capacity and special military knowledge (as instructor, professor, &c.); his fitness for his present post, or any other; his private life.

In a following column a general summary of the officer's qualification is given in a very succinct form. For a subaltern officer this is given as *very good, good, middling, bad.* For captains or field officers in addition it is stated if the officer is fit for promotion in the active army, in the territorial army, or unfit for any promotion.

A further column is devoted to the following opinion:—

If the officer is not fit for high promotion to what grade in the active service should he be advanced?

This note refers to captains and field officers who in addition to physical qualities unite the requisite moral and intellectual qualities for certain ranks without having the qualities requisite to cause them to be looked on as "the men of the future," that is to say, those qualified for the highest commands, but who at the same time should not be deprived of all promotion in the active army.

The last column of the record of service is reserved for remarks, and it is here stated if the officer is worthy of rapid promotion, that it is by selection, and why? It is also here stated if he is fit to command a corps, or act as head of a department, if he has given evidence of readiness and skill in handling troops.

These records of service are sent through the generals of brigade and division, each of whom add their opinions, and transmit the whole with the report of the commanding officer to the minister.

In addition to these triennial records of service, commanding officers send once a year special reports to the minister drawn up on similar forms, pointing out any changes that they think may have taken place in the physical qualities, the instruction or the conduct of the officers, stating any reasons that they may have for modifying any previous opinion as to fitness for promotion; a copy is made and attached to each officer's record of service.

These records as well as the triennial records are destroyed six months after the new records are received. When an officer is transferred from one corps to another, his record is sent to the new corps.

These records are strictly confidential. No one is allowed to see them, much less to copy them; officers composing the committee are bound to secrecy. It is the duty of the president, however, to intimate verbally or in writing to an officer if the report made of him is worse than that made by the last committee.

In working such a system many difficulties must arise from officers being detached, these are met as follows:—

After an officer has served for six months in any special department, he is reported on by the head of that department and the officers in it senior to him. The record of service of an aide-de-camp is sent to the general officer to whom he is attached for his remarks. The orderly officers of the king and princes are dealt with by the king's first aide-de-camp.

The officers attached to the staff are reported on by the commandant of the staff corps.

But wherever an officer is, or however employed, *it is an established principle to give to no one person the power of expressing an opinion which may hasten or retard his promotion.* This duty is intrusted to a committee formed of the seniors under whose eyes the officer has served, and it must be specified, not only if the officer is fit for his present duties, but if he is commonly considered fit for the next highest or any higher rank.

There is but one exception, the commanding officer or head of department, who is reported on by the general under whom he is serving.

These records of service are the basis on which the lists for promotion by seniority and selection are made. Each year before the inspection the same committee assemble, and without reference to the list of previous years, draw up a regimental list for promotion, which by the law of 1854 should merely relate to captains and subalterns; but subsequent ministerial orders have extended the same practice to all regimental officers. ITALY.

As regards the lists for seniority promotion, the number to be placed on the list is fixed by the minister, and whether the officer is fit or not, is entered on the list, as shown on his record of service.

As regards the selection lists, the names of officers only who have performed some special duty, some mission or extraordinary service in an admirable manner, who have shown intelligence, love of military study in a special manner, and who are well known amongst their comrades by their military bearing, and their knowledge of their own arm of the service. These officers must be acknowledged as fit for superior rank, and must be marked in their record of service as deserving of rapid promotion.

At the annual inspection these lists are laid before the inspector-general, whose duty it is to take all requisite steps to obtain information, and verify the accounts given of each officer borne on the lists for promotion.

He gives his opinion on the lists, adding any names he thinks fit, or erasing others; he further adds a list of heads of departments and commanding officers fit for promotion, and forwards the whole to the minister.

In the special services, the carabineers, artillery, and engineers, these lists are referred to special committees summoned by the minister. As regards the staff corps, the general, as the head of the corps, draws up the records of service of those immediately under him, he makes his observations on the reports of the generals commanding divisions on the various staff officers, and with the aid of a committee of general officers and colonels on the staff, prepares a list of officers for promotion in the staff corps, as well as proposals for transferring officers of the various arms to and from and into the staff corps.

The minister himself, from the information so obtained, draws up the lists of those to be promoted by seniority and selection. As promotion is by the arm of the service, the order in which the officers of the various regiments stand on these lists is of great importance. This is always done by seniority, as taken from the army list. So that finally the two lists in the hands of the minister become one, and from this list all promotions are made. The French reviewer, after describing minutely the process by which promotion is carried out, adds:—"Promotion so conducted "produces neither rivalry nor jealousy, nor, it must be "added, those intrigues which tarnish the honour, destroy "concord, good fellowship, and mutual esteem amongst a "body of officers."

Looking at the question of military promotion in Italy during the last year, it seems that promotion by selection has since the re-organisation of the staff corps been reserved almost entirely for the officers who have passed the superior war school and served on the staff.* These officers get not only a step of rank at starting, but rapid promotion in the future. They are the "officers of the future," which the new military institution of Italy seek not only to create, but also to promote.

Sismondo thus sums up the promotion in the Italian army:—

(*a.*) Promotion assured to seniority, provided it be united to capacity, capacity being determined by examinations for sub-lieutenant, captain, and major.

(*b.*) Rapid promotion, open to superior ability, by selection based on trials open to all officers of the army on even terms through the superior war school, otherwise no promotion, except for actual meritorious service under fire.

As regards generals, no major-general can be promoted to be lieutenant-general who has not for at least one year, or throughout a campaign, commanded as a general. If no major-general is available fulfilling these conditions, promotions are not made, and the divisions are commanded by major-generals, the brigades by colonels, until officers fulfilling the conditions are found. No lieutenant-general can be made a general who has not commanded an army or an army corps, served as chief of the staff to an army, or commanded the artillery or engineers of an army in the field,

The French reviewer says:—"It must be acknowledged

* This is shown by the Gazettes only.

"that every means has been taken by the Italian Government to procure a body of well-taught, capable, and active officers."

The Italian army is young, and took its rise amid great enthusiasm, and was formed by the fusion of the Sardinian army with those of the other provinces and many Garibaldian volunteers. It became, when the army was reorganised in 1871, requisite to largely reduce the number of officers, retaining the best. This placed a very large number in the position of being unemployed or supernumerary to the cadres. These officers fairly checked all promotion, and in 1871 a law was passed to enable the minister to deal with this state of things.

He was empowered to place on the retired list—

1°. Officers of all ranks and employés holding relative rank who were supernumerary, and who from personal reasons or other causes were considered unsuitable for service.

2°. Officers of all grades who were serving at that time, or who within 10 months after should be found by their records of service to be unfit for active service in their arm of the service. Any such officer who had at least eight years' service was granted a gratuity or a permanent pension.

As this was compulsory retirement on a very large scale, it is interesting to see how it was worked:—A Royal decree directed that all officers who were selected for retirement should receive an official intimation to that effect. They had the right of appeal for a fortnight. If they appealed, a general officer, specially selected, examined the officers and their records of service; officers who were supernumerary were temporarily recalled to be so examined. The examination was made in presence of the regimental committees, both in the theory and practice of their profession, with the aid of the generals of brigade for the cavalry and infantry, and the commandants for the artillery and engineers. If the officers were pronounced unfit, they had another appeal to a committee of lieutenant-generals, presided over by General Cialdini. This committee decided the question finally, for officers of every rank, that the minister wished to retire compulsorily, and who refused to be so retired. All records of service, papers, correspondence, &c. being laid before them. By these means 630 officers were summarily retired in 1871, 1,198 in 1872. The lists of supernumerary officers resulting from the war of 1866, and the alteration of the Italian battalion from the French to the German model, were thus largely reduced. The result being, according to the French reviewer, that the Italian body of officers is equal to any in the world, but while the quality was improved the supply appears to have diminished, for in 1871 the army lost 1,410 officers, getting only 144. In 1872 the army lost 1,811 officers, getting only 258. And the difficulty of getting officers appears to be still great. the enthusiasm which filled the army has cooled, and the Italian young men appear to prefer trade, commerce, or even idleness, to the profession of arms.

Sismondo points out the causes for this. He points out that men in Italy enter the army for pay, promotion, or position, and he gives the following comparative table of the pay of officers in France, Germany, and Italy:—

—	Germany.	France.	Italy.
	£	£	£
Colonel	413	302	268
Lieutenant-colonel	299	232	200
Major	299	197	160
1st captain	209	130	112
2nd „	120	118	100
1st lieutenant	64	91	78
2nd „	55	87	—
Sub-lieutenant	—	83	70

He points out that the most important body of officers in an army are the captains; that under the existing state of affairs it is desirable to improve the position of the captains, and give liberal retirements in that grade, so as to induce a large number of men to be satisfied with the captain's rank as a termination of their career. To do this he proposes a compulsory retirement at 27 years' service, and a large increase of pay for officers of that rank.

The pay of Italian officers is paid in peace monthly, in war fortnightly. All officers are paid by the nearest paymaster.

An increase of pay is always given after six years' service in the same rank.

Militia officers if not one year volunteers receive a gratuity of 8*l.* a year, and when employed the pay and allowances of their rank.

All newly appointed officers receive an advance of 12*l.*, to be repaid by monthly deductions. Under certain circumstances, deserving officers may get their pay in advance.

On short leave, officers get all their pay and allowances. On long sick leave, half-pay, on long leave, for private affairs, no pay.

Officers supernumerary to the establishment receive $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{2}{5}$, or $\frac{3}{5}$ of their regular pay, according to their rank. All officers are subject to stoppages for the pension fund.

Up to 48*l.* a year	2 per cent.
From 48*l.* to 80*l.* a year	3 „
From 80*l.* to 120*l.* a year	4 „
Exceeding 120*l.*	5 „

6½ per cent. is at all times deducted for income tax; and officers on promotion have to surrender ½ to ⅓ the increase of pay for the first year as a promotion fine.

Regimental bands are maintained by the State, each regiment receiving 320*l.* annually for the purpose. A small stoppage is made when officers are on leave for the same purpose.

The following stoppages are made in peace from officers in hospitals:—

Generals	6*s.* 8*d.* per diem.
Field officers	4*s.* 2*d.* „
Captains	2*s.* 11*d.* „
Subalterns	2*s.* 1*d.* „

Extra pay is given to officers holding certain high commands, but if any officer falls temporarily into such command he does not get the pay.

All Italian officers have a railway pass, which entitles them to travel on or off duty at an exceedingly low rate.

Mission abroad, escort duty, &c., are all accompanied by some small pay.

The loss of horses or property in action are fully made good to officers.

All mounted officers draw forage according to rank, also a certain sum to cover the purchase, shoeing, &c., of the horse.

These sums are paid directly to field officers, for others the money is paid into a fund.

In garrison a forage ration is 6½ lbs. of oats, 13¼ lbs. hay.

An extra lb. of oats is given when encamped, and 2 lbs. when on the march.

A ration of forage is calculated at 1*s.* 3*d.*; officers who keep horses in excess of those allowed may draw forage for them at this rate. All clothes, equipment, and stores may be purchased at low rates in a similar way.

Any mounted subaltern is entitled to buy a horse from the nearest cavalry regiment at from 28*l.* to 32*l.* for his own use.

In the field, officers get two rations, termed Etappen rations, one in kind, the same as the men, the other in money.

Officers of all arms are allowed servants as follows:—

Generals and commanding officers of regiments, two servants.

Field officers, and mounted or detached officers, one servant.

Other officers at the rate of one servant amongst two officers.

If officers wish to marry, the officer and the lady must have between them, in addition to the officer's pay, 80*l.* a year for subalterns, 64*l.* for captains, 48*l.* for field officers. Generals may marry as they please.

The following table shows the pay and allowances of officers:—

APP. A. ITALY

Scale of Pay and Allowances of Officers and Employés.

ITALY.

Rank.	Pay. Annual (per Annum.)	Increase of Six-yearly Pay.	Travelling Allowance.	Marching Allowance.	No. of Forage Rations.	Cantonment Allowance. Money Allowance.	Cantonment Allowance. Quarters found.	War Allowances. Outfit Allowance for taking the Field.	War Allowances. War Extra Pay.	War Allowances. Etappen Rations.	War Allowances. Forage Allowance Rations.
	Annual (per Annum.)	Six-yearly Pay.	Daily (per diem).				Rooms.	Paid only once.	Daily (per diem).		
	£	£ s. d.	s. d.	s. d.		£ s. d.		£	s. d.		
General	600	—	14 9	6 8	6	1 0 0	6	240	0 9	—	8
Lieutenant-general	480	—	13 11	6 8	5	0 13 4	5	180	0 7	—	8
Major-general (with troops)	360	—	8 4	6 8	4	0 7 6	5	120	0 3½	—	8
Major-general (holding a fixed appointment)	360	—	8 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colonel — Artillery and Engineers	280	16 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 11	4	60	0 0¾	3	5
Colonel — Bersaglieri and Infantry	264	16 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 11	3	40	0 0¾	3	3
Colonel — Cavalry	280	16 0 0	4 2	2 6	4	0 2 11	3	60	0 0¾	3	6
Lieut.-Colonel — Artillery and Engineers	212	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 1	3	40	0 0¾	3	5
Lieut.-Colonel — Bersaglieri and Infantry	200	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 1	2	34	0 0¾	3	3
Lieut.-Colonel — Cavalry	212	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	3	0 2 1	2	40	0 0¾	3	5
Major — Artillery and Engineers	172	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 1	3	34	0 0¾	2	3
Major — Bersaglieri and Infantry	160	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	2	0 2 1	2	39	0 0¾	2	2
Major — Cavalry	172	12 0 0	4 2	2 6	3	0 2 1	2	34	0 0¾	2	4
Captain — Artillery and Engineers	124	7 6 8	3 1½	1 8	1	0 1 8	2	24	0 0½	2	2
Captain — Bersaglieri and Infantry	112	7 6 8	3 1½	1 8	1	0 1 0	1	20	0 0½	2	—
Captain — Cavalry	124	7 6 8	3 1½	1 8	3	0 1 8	1	24	0 0½	2	3
1st. Lieut. — Artillery and Engineers	88	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	—	0 1 8	1	16	0 0½	2	2
1st. Lieut. — Bersaglieri and Infantry	80	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	—	0 1 0	1	16	0 0½	2	—
1st. Lieut. — Cavalry	88	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	2	0 1 8	1	16	0 0½	2	
Lieut. — Artillery and Engineers	80	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	—	0 1 8	1	16	0 0½	2	
Lieut. — Bersaglieri and Infantry	72	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	—	0 1 0	1	12	0 0½	2	—
Lieut. — Cavalry	80	4 16 0	3 1½	1 8	2	0 1 8	1	16	0 0½	2	2

A general holding a command gets 56*l.* a year lodging money, and a further sum of 32*l.* for office expenses.

Subalterns in Florence, Naples, Palermo, Milan, and Turin get 4*l.* 16*s.*, and in Rome all officers get 12*l.* a year lodging money.

Officers on the staff draw cavalry pay and allowances.

In addition to the pay shown in the tables,—

General officers holding certain appointments get command pay as follows:—

	£
President of the general committee	320
General officers commanding divisions and the military schools get	145
Colonels, commandants of artillery and engineers, and general officers commanding brigades, get	48
Colonels, heads of division in the War Office	36
Commanding officers of regiments	24

The above sums are attached to the appointments and are paid to the officer performing the duties.

The following are personal to the individual:—

	£
General of an army	120
Professors at colleges or schools, or assistant professors, or field officers in charge of sections at the War Office	from 32*l.* to 12*l.* a year.

The following is the pension table of the Italian army:—

Pensions of Officers.

Rank.	Minimum after 30 Years' service above the rank of Captain after 25 years' service for other Ranks.	Increase for every Year's service, or every Campaign.	Maximum for 40 years' service, Campaigns included.
	Per Annum.		
	£	£ s. d.	£
General	320	—	320
Lieutenant-general	260	6 0 0	320
Major-general	200	6 0 0	260
Colonel	152	4 16 0	200
Lieutenant-colonel	120	4 0 0	160
Major	100	2 18 4	128
Captain	76	1 9 2	90
Lieutenant	45	1 0 0	60
Sub-lieutenant	40	0 16 0	52

R. Home, Lt.-Colonel,
D.A.Q.M.G.

RUSSIA.

Promotion.

A.—To the Rank of Officer.

RUSSIA.

Promotion to the rank of officer, in time of peace, rests with the Emperor only; in time of war, however, the general commanding the army has the power of filling up all vacancies in the force under his command.

Unexceptionable conduct, and a competent knowledge of his profession determined by examination, are the absolutely essential qualifications for promotion to the rank of officer.

It is open to all combatant non-commissioned officers to qualify for promotion to the rank of officer.

The examination which candidates for the rank of officer in the infantry, rifles, or cavalry are required to pass, previous to appointments, comprises the subjects taught at the war, or at the cadet schools.

Candidates who pass the examination of the war or cadet schools with honours are nominated to the rank of ensign or cornet in the guard, or of sub-lieutenant in the line, without reference to the number of vacancies. Before being finally appointed the candidate must serve for from 2 to 12 months with his regiment to acquire a practical knowledge of his duties.

Candidates who pass the examination with good certificates are appointed cadets, and are promoted to the rank of ensign or cornet in the line as vacancies occur. The cadet wears a silver sword knot and gold lace on the sleeves. His pay is from 16*l.* to 24*l.* a year. In matters of discipline he is treated as an officer, and can be deprived of his rank only by sentence of court-martial. He has the right of claiming discharge, retaining rank if he desires it.

Non-commissioned officers who have completed four years' service are allowed to attend the cadet schools, if of good moral character, and possessed of the requisite amount of elementary knowledge. In case of failure they can present themselves again at the expiration of one year.

Persons belonging to the following categories are debarred from becoming officers, and are consequently not allowed to attend the cadet schools or come up for examination, namely, persons who have been sentenced to, or have undergone, corporal punishment; persons who have at any time committed a dishonourable crime or have belonged to a disciplinary company. Those who have received corporal punishment and those who have committed a dishonourable crime can never be promoted; the others may, however, regain their privilege by distinguished conduct before the enemy.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of officer in the artillery and engineers are required to pass the prescribed examination at their respective war schools. Those who pass with honours are appointed sub-lieutenants (ensigns in the guard) and those who pass with good certificates, ensigns.

B.—Promotion of Officers.

Promotion during peace is made by the Emperor; in time of war, the general commanding-in-chief of the army in the field has the power to promote the officers under his orders subject to the subsequent sanction of the Emperor.

(a.) *Infantry, Cavalry, and Rifles.*

Promotion up to the rank of captain goes by seniority. In the higher ranks it follows no fixed rule. Officers of each rank, up to that of captain inclusive, in every regiment of an infantry or cavalry division or in the battalions belonging to two rifle brigades, are placed on the same general list for purposes of promotion, and the steps, as they occur, are given by seniority on this list within the division or the two rifle brigades.

Promotion to the rank of major and to higher field rank takes place exclusively according to merit. On a vacancy occurring all those of the junior rank who have held that rank for two (in the case of captain, three) years are admitted as candidates for the higher appointment. The application of each officer must be endorsed by the opinions of the officers commanding the regiment and division, and of the general of the district, and the list is afterwards forwarded by the local authorities to the war ministry.

(b.) *Artillery.*

Promotion goes by seniority up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel; above that rank by selection. Officers of each rank (below that of lieutenant-colonel) are placed on a general list for purposes of promotion :—

Field artillery of the guard.
" " line.
Horse artillery of the guard.
" " line.
Garrison artillery.

Promotion to the higher ranks is made by selection, as in the infantry, &c.

(c.) *Engineers.*

Promotion to the rank of lieutenant-colonel goes by seniority; in the higher grades by selection. Officers of each rank in the following branches of this arm are placed on a general list for purposes of promotion :—

Battalion of sappers of the body guard.
The whole of the sapper battalions, including the field telegraph park.
The pontooner-battalions.
The engineer administrative department.
The engineer park detachments.

A step of promotion up to the rank of captain takes place every two years. The requisite number of vacancies is created by placing a corresponding number of second captains and captains on the list of candidates for promotion to major and lieutenant-colonel in the infantry and cavalry.

Promotion to the higher ranks is given in the same manner as in the infantry, &c.

(d.) *General Staff.*

Officers of the general staff are placed for purposes of promotion, on one general list. They receive one step of promotion every two years, up to the rank of captain, if properly qualified. A captain, qualified for further promotion, and who has undergone a practical test as a field officer, is promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel on completing three years' service in this rank.

The chief of the head-quarter staff can direct the names of officers of the general staff to be inserted on the list of candidates for appointment as regimental field officers. Promotion to the rank of colonel and general on the general staff is conducted in the same manner as in the other arms. The general staff is recruited exclusively from students who have passed the general staff academy with honours. The attached officers of the general staff are promoted in their own corps according to seniority.

Pay and Allowances of Officers.

The pay and allowances of officers consist of :—

Pay.
Lodging allowance.
Table money.
Special allowances.
Forage and allowance for keep of horses.
Travelling allowance.
Servants' allowance.
Rations in time of war.

Russian officers also receive grants of money from government funds which are so regulated as to form virtually a part of the ordinary pay.

(a.) *Pay.*

All ranks have two scales of pay, namely, normal pay (in peace) and increased pay (in war).

Deductions are made from the pay of all officers, whether on the active or supernumerary list. The former pay 2½ per cent. as subscriptions to the sick fund, and 6 per cent. to the pension fund, the latter pay 2½ per cent. to the sick fund, and the same to the pension fund. The subscription to the sick fund gives officers the right to be attended gratis in the imperial hospitals.

The increased pay is drawn by all officers in time of war, and during peace by the following, namely, officers stationed in Transcaucasia, in the military districts of Turkestan, eastern and western Siberia, in the provinces of Daghestan, Kuban, and Terek; officers of the instruction-troops; officers holding appointments in, or studying at the military educational establishments; officers attending the schools of musketry at St. Petersburgh and Sestoryeck; officers attached to members of the imperial family, or employed on special duties.

The annual pay of officers is given in the annexed table :—

Normal Pay.

	Active.			Supernumerary.		
	Old Guard.	Young Guard Artillery, Technical Troops and Corps, General Staff and Judicial Staff.	Infantry and Cavalry of the Line, and Battalions of Rifles of the Line.	Old Guard.	Young Guard, Artillery, Technical Troops and Corps, General Staff and Judicial Staff.	Infantry and Cavalry of the Line, and Battalions of Rifles of the line.
	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
General	297 17	297 17	297 17	230 5	230 5	230 5
Lieutenant-general	238 6	238 6	238 6	184 7	184 7	184 7
Major-general	178 14	178 14	178 14	138 9	138 9	138 9
Colonel	120 15	120 15	120 15	82 18	82 18	82 18
Lieutenant-colonel	—	93 8	93 8	—	69 5	69 5
Major	—	—	77 6	—	—	55 11
Captain	93 8	77 6	64 8	69 5	55 11	50 14
Second captain	77 6	64 8	59 11	55 11	50 14	46 14
Lieutenant	64 8	59 11	54 15	50 14	46 14	40 9
Sub-lieutenant	59 11	54 15	51 10	46 14	40 9	37 1
Ensign or cornet	54 15	51 10	48 6	40 9	37 1	36 4

NORMAL PAY—*continued.*

	Active.			Supernumerary.		
	Old Guard.	Young Guard, Artillery, Technical Troops and Corps, General Staff and Judicial Staff.	Infantry and Cavalry of the Line, and Battalions of Rifles of the Line.	Old Guard.	Young Guard, Artillery, Technical Troops and Corps, General Staff and Judicial Staff.	Infantry and Cavalry of the Line, and Battalions of Rifles of the Line.
Increased Pay.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.			
General	446 15	446 15	446 15			
Lieutenant	357 8	357 8	357 8			
Major-general	268 1	268 1	268 1			
Colonel	181 2	181 2	181 2			
Lieutenant-colonel	—	140 1	140 1			
Major	—	—	115 18			
Captain	140 1	115 18	96 12			
Second captain	115 18	96 12	89 7			
Lieutenant	96 12	89 7	82 2			
Sub-lieutenant	89 7	82 2	77 6			
Fusign or cornet	82 2	77 6	72 9			

General, field, and regimental officers, and military officials, employed in the various military bureaux, &c., receive fixed annual salaries, according to the appointments they respectively hold.

(b.) *Lodging Allowance.*

Every officer is entitled to quarters or to a money allowance in lieu of quarters, and, if accommodated in public buildings, to an allowance of fuel and light.

Lodging allowance varies in different garrison towns, but officers attached to heads of departments draw a uniform lodging allowance amounting to one-fourth of their pay.

The following rates of lodging allowance were authorised, Jan. 1, 1873:—

	In Towns of the			
	First Class.	Second Class.	Third Class.	Fourth Class.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
General	231 17 6	154 11 8	115 18 9	77 5 10
Lieutenant-general	185 10 0	123 13 4	77 5 10	61 16 8
Major-general	123 13 4	77 5 10	61 6 8	46 7 6
Officer commanding a regiment.	77 5 10	61 6 8	54 2 0	38 12 11
Other field officers	46 7 6	36 12 11	30 3 4	23 3 9
Officers commanding a company.	30 13 4	27 1 0	23 3 9	15 9 2
Other officers	23 3 9	19 6 5	15 9 2	10 16 5

In the first class are Riga, Wilna, Kasan, Kief, &c.; in the second class, Archangel, Astrakhan, Reval, Mittau, &c.; in the third class, Warna, Dünaburg, Minsk, &c.

(c.) *Table Money.*

The great majority of officers holding posts of importance receive table money in addition to their ordinary pay. The following are the amounts allowed according to the regulations of January 1, 1873, on this subject:—

	£	s.	d.
General commanding a division in a military district	602	17	6
General officer commanding a division in the Finland military district, and the Transcaucasus	510	2	6
Chief of the brigade of sappers, and the chief of the district staff, each	510	2	6
Officer second in command of the division	417	7	6
Officer commanding a regiment, and officer commanding the artillery of a first-class fortress	417	7	6
Officer in command of a fortress regiment	371	0	0
Chief of the staff, and officer commanding a regiment of a second class fortress	231	17	6
Officer commanding an independent regiment of sappers	278	5	0
Officer commanding a battalion of Rifles or of the Line	231	17	6
Officer commanding a battalion of a fortress of the third class	185	10	0
Officer second in command of a regiment and battalion	92	15	0
Officer in command of a company	46	7	6
Subaltern officer	14	16	9

(d.) *Special allowances.*

All officers receive subsistence allowance when on the march, during manœuvres and concentrations of troops, and whilst in charge of buildings. Field officers draw 1*s.* 11*d.* and other officers 11*d.* per diem. Officers of the general staff and of the topographical corps draw the allowance while employed on reconnaissances, surveys, &c., the field officers receiving 2*s.* 11*d.*, other officers 1*s.* 11*d.* per diem.

(e.) *Forage allowance, and allowances for keep of horses.*

Officers, except those who belong to the divisions of gendarmerie in the three capital cities, are not allowed government horses.

Mounted officers are entitled to forage for one horse in time of peace, with the exception of commanding officers drawing table-money, who procure their own forage.

(f.) *Travelling allowances.*

Officers travelling on duty or on the march from one station to another are allowed travelling expenses.

(g.) *Servants' allowances.*

General officers are allowed three, field officers two, and regimental officers one soldier servant each, who continue to draw the same pay as in the ranks.

Married captains and subalterns are entitled to two servants each, married field officers to three servants each, and married generals to four servants each.

Officers who do not require the number of servants allowed them by regulation are entitled to an allowance of 15*l.* a year for each servant they do not require.

(h.) *Presents.*

No officer can receive in the shape of presents or additional means of support more than 18*l.* in the course of one year. These presents, &c. are granted by the Emperor, and are paid on his birthday, or name day, on great festivals, after grand parades, &c.

T. JESSOP, Capt., Scots Greys,
D.A.Q.M.G.

SPAIN.

PROMOTION.

SPAIN.

The system of promotion in the Spanish army to within a short time of the outbreak of the last civil war was subject to no rule. Different systems prevailed in the different arms and promotion went mainly by favour. But just before the civil war an attempt was made to introduce the seniority system; promotion was to have been equalised among the different arms and the promotion to general officer strictly carried out according to seniority, so as to avoid those unseemly demonstrations which universally took place in favour of, or against, any particular officer.

The system of brevet promotion also existed in the Spanish army; lieutenant-colonels being found in the command of companies, and general officers in command of regiments.

PAY AND PENSION.

The pay of the officers is comparatively high, if the cheapness of living, and the simplicity of life of a Spanish officer, be taken into consideration.

Irrespective of allowances, of which there are many, the pay of the officers is as follows:—according to the estimates for 1870–71.

	£
War Office:	
Chief of general staff (Lieutenant-General,) Inspector-General of Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers (Lieutenants-General)	937
General Staff:	
Brigadier on the staff	375
Colonel	288
Lieutenant-Colonel	225
Major	200
Captain	150
Lieutenant	88
Staff of Districts:	
(Large allowances often attached to these appointments.)	
Captains-General	1,250
Lieutenant-General or Major-General commanding a district	625 to 469
Brigadiers	416 to 208
Colonels	287
Lieutenant-Colonels	225
Infantry:	
Colonel commanding regiment (Command allowance in addition 63*l.*)	288
Lieutenant-colonel commanding battalion	225
Major	220
Captain	125
Lieutenants	69 to 81
Cavalry:	
Colonel	287
Lieutenant-colonel	225
Major	200
Captain	150
Artillery and Engineers:	
Major-general	625
Brigadiers	375
Colonel commanding regiment (Command pay, 63*l.*)	287
Lieutenant-colonel	225
Major	200
Captains	125
Lieutenant	81

The pension was calculated according to length of service. A colonel after 40 years' service received a pension of 235*l.*; a captain after 25 years received 50*l.*

Proportion of Officers on the Active List and Retired List.

In the same estimates the number of officers on the active list is shown as 6,997; that on the retired list (exclusive of reserve officers) amounts to 731.

Cost of Active List compared with the Retired List.

The cost of the active list, exclusive of all allowances, is about 128,000*l.*, that of the retired list about 125,000*l.*

F. C. H. CLARKE, Capt., R.A.,
D.A.Q.M.G.

SWEDEN.

SWEDEN.

An alteration has been recently made in the system of officering this army. Formerly candidates for commissioned rank entered the war school, as boys, direct from civil life, and received their appointments at the termination of the prescribed term of study; the war school was then a polytechnic school, the programme of study being based on a very general education. Under the new regulations, every candidate must commence service in the ranks, and must perform two military trainings, viz., a recruit school, lasting 42 days, and a regimental exercise of from three to four weeks, as a proof of his practical fitness for a military career; he may then be admitted to the war school, on producing certificates showing him to have completed the full course of study at some one of the higher class civil schools and to have passed the final examination called the "students' examination" with credit. The war school has indeed been turned into a purely technical military college, and is a training school for aspirants to commissioned rank in the army generally; it comprises two summer terms for practical work, and one winter term for theoretical study, the course commencing in July of one year and terminating in October of the succeeding year.

This new system came into operation in 1873.

There are three ranks of officers, viz.:—

(*a.*) General officers, with three grades, general, lieutenant-general, major-general.

(*b.*) Field officers, with three grades, colonel, lieutenant-colonel, major.

(*c.*) Regimental officers, with three grades, captain, lieutenant, sub-lieutenant.

Some of these grades have several classes of pay.

In the regimental ranks, promotion takes place by seniority and without examination, excepting in the Artillery and Engineers, when sub-lieutenants are required to go through a technical course of study at the "Military High School" to qualify for promotion to lieutenant.

In the senior ranks, promotion is given invariably by selection.

All officers may claim retirement with pension on completing 50 years of age, otherwise only if invalided.

The peculiar organisation still in force in Sweden makes a just comparison of the rates of pay a matter of great difficulty.

It is, namely, based in great part on the old feudal system, and the officers derive their pay from the crown lands, either in kind or in cash according to circumstances. There is only a very small proportion of garrisoned troops obtained by voluntary enlistment and retained permanently at duty, whose officers are in every case paid in cash according to a fixed scale. That part of the army furnished by the proprietors of the soil, and termed the "Indelta" (distributed) troops, receives a different scale of pay and allowances in the different provinces, according to the value of the land, &c.: this is the case with the officers as well as with the men. The enlisted portion of the army comprises only one regiment of Horse Guards, two regiments of Foot Guards, three regiments of Artillery, two battalions of Engineers, one regiment of line cavalry, and one regiment of line Infantry; the latter, however, though obtained by the same system of recruitment, differs from the other portions of this force, in that it is not permanently retained at duty, the personnel being furloughed immediately after the summer drills. In the following table will be found the fixed scale of pay and allowances assigned to the various ranks and grades in the "enlisted force;" out of this pay all mounted officers excepting the regimental officers of Artillery, are required to provide their horses.

APP. A.

SWEDEN.

—	Annual Pay inclusive of Horse and Forage Allowance.						Lodging and Servant Allowance.		
	Foot Guards (2 regiments).	Horse Guards (1 regiment).	Artillery (3 regiments.)	Engineers (2 battalions).	Cavalry (1 regiment).	Infantry (1 regiment).	At Stockholm.	At Göteborg.	Elsewhere.
	£	£							
General commanding military district	—	514 inclusive of all allowances.							
Inspector-general of Cavalry	—	386 „ „ „					exclusive of travelling allowances when on duty.		
Inspector-general of Engineers	—	430 „ „ „							
Inspector-general of Artillery	—	514 „ „ „							
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£ s.	£	£ s.
Colonel commandant	385	428	406	286	428	257	43 0	40	32 0
Lieutenant-colonel and major, 1st class	299	320	299	257	320	172	32 0	24	23 0
Major, 2nd class	271	292	271	228	292	143	32 0	24	17 0
Major, 3rd class	271	292	271	228	292	143	32 0	24	17 0
Captain, 1st class	136	180	136	240	134	68	13 0	12	7 0
Captain, 2nd class	116	180	116	183	134	68	13 0	12	7 0
Lieutenant, 1st class	68	112	68	100	112	46	8 5	8	4 5
Lieutenant, 2nd class	53	100	68	88	100	30	8 5	8	4 5
Sub-lieutenant	46	84	46	76	84	28	8 5	8	4 5

In the "Indelta" force, the average rates are estimated as follows:—

—	Infantry.	Cavalry.
	£	£
Colonel commandant	308	373
Lieutenant-colonel and major, 1st class	160	200
Major, 2nd class	100	156
Major, 3rd class	84	—
Captain, 1st class	68	128
Captain, 2nd class	43	83
Lieutenant, 1st class	30	63
Lieutenant, 2nd class	26	59
Sub-lieutenant	17	45

The following table shows the age at which officers of the several grades have claim to retirement with pension, and the scale of pension allowed. On retirement with pension, every officer is still liable for some kind of service within the boundaries of the country in time of war.

—	Age at which Pension may be claimed.	Age up to which the Pensioner is still liable for Service in Time of War within the Boundaries of the Kingdom.	Scale of Pension.
			£
General officer	65	—	343
Colonel commanding	60	65	172
Lieutenant-colonel and major, 1st class, of enlisted troops.	55	65	128
Lieutenant-colonel and major, 1st class, of indelta troops, and major, 2nd class, of enlisted troops.	55	65	114
Major, 2nd and 3rd class, of indelta	55	65	86
Captain, 1st class enlisted troops	50	60	86
Captain, 1st class, indelta, and captain, 2nd class, enlisted troops.	50	60	57
Lieutenant, 1st class	50	60	40
Lieutenant, 2nd class	50	60	29
Sub-lieutenant	50	60	23

The estimates give no information with regard to the strength or cost of the pension list.

WILLIAM S. COOKE,
Captain, 22nd Regiment,
D.A.Q.M.G.

SWITZERLAND.

PAY.

SWITZERLAND.

The Swiss Army has recently undergone a thorough re-organisation. For the future the rates of daily pay of the officers will be as follows:—

Rank.	Daily Pay.
	£ s. d.
Officer commanding-in-chief	2 0 0
Chief of the general staff	1 12 0
Commissary	1 0 0
Adjutant-general and officer commanding a division.	1 4 0
Colonel commanding a brigade	1 0 0
Colonel	0 16 0
Lieutenant-colonel	0 12 0
Major	0 9 7
Captain	0 8 0
1st lieutenant	0 6 5
Lieutenant	0 5 7
Staff secretary	0 4 9

Every officer, without distinction of rank, also receives one ration.

'Adjutants' of every department of the staff, captains and first lieutenants of Artillery, and officers of Cavalry, are allowed two rations of forage, 'Adjutants' receive an additional sum of 1s. 8d. per day.

The following are the rates of pay per diem of the various branches of the service in the Swiss Army:—

STAFF.

—	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Colonel commanding a division	18 1
„ „ brigade	13 7
Colonel	13 7
Lieutenant-colonel	10 2
Major	7 9
Captain	6 3
Lieutenant	4 8
1st sub-lieutenant	3 11
2nd „	3 6

INFANTRY.

—	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Major	6 9
Captain	4 6
Lieutenant	3 1
1st sub-lieutenant	2 7
2nd „	2 1

SWITZERLAND.

Pay of Officers of Carabineers.

Rank.	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Captain	4 6
Lieutenant	3 1
1st sub-lieutenant	2 7
2nd „	2 1

Pay of Officers of Cavalry.

Rank.	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Captain	5 1
Lieutenant	3 7
1st sub-lieutenant	2 11
2nd „	2 6

Pay of Officers of Artillery.

Rank.	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Captain	5 1
Lieutenant	3 7
1st sub-lieutenant	2 11
2nd „	2 6

Pay of Officers of Engineers.

Rank.	Rate of Pay per Diem.
	s. d.
Captain	5 1
Lieutenant	3 7
1st sub-lieutenant	2 11
2nd „	2 6

APP. A.

UNITED STATES.

UNITED STATES.

Pay.

The following are the yearly rates of pay of officers in active service and of retired officers :—

	Active Service.	Retired.
	£	£
General	2,700	—
Lieutenant-general	2,200	—
Major-general	1,500	1,125
Brigadier-general	1,100	825
Colonel	700	525
Lieutenant-colonel	600	450
Major	500	375
Captain, mounted	400	300
„ not mounted	360	270
Regimental adjutant	360	—
„ quartermaster	360	—
1st lieutenant, mounted	320	240
„ „ not mounted	300	225
2nd „ mounted	300	225
„ „ not mounted	280	210
Chaplain	300	270

These "sums are in full of all commutation of quarters, "fuel, forage, servants' wages and clothing, longevity, "rations, and all allowances of every name and nature "whatever, and shall be paid monthly by the paymaster; "provided, that fuel, quarters and forage in kind, may be "furnished to officers of the quartermasters' department "as now allowed by law and regulations." (Section 24, Act, July 15, 1870.)

APP. B.

APPENDIX B.

Royal Commissions and Committees on Army Promotion and Retirement.

The following is a list of the principal Royal Commissions and Committees which have inquired into questions bearing upon promotion and retirement in the army during the last fifty years.

1.—1833. A Select Committee on "Army and Navy "Appointments."
Chairman, Viscount Ebrington.

2.—1840. A Royal Commission on "Naval and Military "promotion and retirement."
Chairman, The Duke of Wellington.

3.—1854. A Royal Commission on "Promotion in the "Army."
Chairman, The Right Hon. Sidney Herbert.

4.—1857. A Royal Commission on "Purchase and Sale "of Commissions in the Army."
Chairman, The Duke of Somerset.

5.—1858. A Royal Commission on "Promotion and "Retirement in the higher ranks of the Army."
Chairman, The Right Hon. Sidney Herbert.

6.—1863. A Royal Commision to consider the case of certain Colonels promoted for distinguished service.
Chairman, Lieut.-General Peel.

7.—1867. A Select Committee on the "Army (system of "retirement from the non-purchase corps of Royal Artil-"lery, Royal Engineers, and Royal Marines)."
Chairman, Mr. Childers.

8.—1870. A War Office Committee on "Promotion and "Retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps."
Chairman, The Hon. John C. W. Vivian.

9.—1874. A Royal Commission on "Certain Memorials "from officers in the army in reference to the abolition of "purchase."
Chairman, The Lord Justice Sir W. M. James.

APP. C.

APPENDIX C.

Promotion under the Purchase System.

Question for the War Office Actuaries.

What rapidity of promotion may be considered as having obtained on the average in the several arms of the service during the 30 years which preceded the abolition of purchase?

Actuaries' Report. (No. 73.)

On the 1st January in each of the years 1840, 1846, 1852, 1858, 1864, and 1870, the services of the officers then on full pay were as shown in §§ 1 and 2 of this report. The average of these six periods gives the following results :—

The rank of Lieutenant-Colonel was obtained :—
In the Household Cavalry after 24 years 8 months.
„ Cavalry of the Line „ 20 „ 4 „
„ Infantry of the Line „ 23 „ 6 „

The rank of Major was obtained :—
In the Household Cavalry after 19 years 5 months.
„ Cavalry of the Line „ 15 „ 10 „
„ Infantry of the Line „ 18 „ 11 „

The rank of Captain was obtained. :—
In the Household Cavalry after 7 years 1 month.
„ Cavalry of the Line „ 7 „ 5 „
„ Infantry of the Line „ 9 „

The rank of Lieutenant was obtained :—
In the Household Cavalry after 2 years 10 months.
„ Cavalry of the Line „ 2 „ 5 „
„ Infantry of the Line „ 2 „ 8 „

In the Foot Guards the several ranks were on the averag obtained after the following periods of service.

The ranks of—

	yrs.	mths
Regimental Lieut.-Colonel after	29	4
Regimental Major „	26	3
Captain and Lieut.-Colonel „	13	3
Lieutenant and Captain „	4	4

The details from which we obtained the above results are as follows :—

Averages of Service on attaining certain Regimental Ranks.

1. The average service after which regimental promotion was obtained by the officers who were serving in the Household Cavalry, Cavalry of the Line, and Infantry of the Line, excluding Colonial Corps, respectively, on the 1st January in the years 1840, 1846, 1852, 1858, 1864, 1870, (according to Hart's Army List):—

[Non-Purchase Regiments excluded.]

Year.	Service as Major.			Service as Captain.			Service as Lieutenant.			Service as Cornet or Ensign.			Year.
	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	
Household Cavalry.													
	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	
1840	7 5	—	7 5	9 11	—	9 11	4 3	—	4 3	2 10	3 5	2 11	1840
1846	8 1	—	8 1	13 9	—	13 9	4 11	—	4 11	3 1	3 5	3 3	1846
1852	9 2	8 11	9 1	15 4	18 5	15 10	4 9	—	4 9	3 3	3 11	3 4	1852
1858	4 2	7 7	5 4	14 2	18 5	14 10	4 4	6 4	4 6	2 10	2 10	2 10	1858
1864	3 5	2 0	2 11	11 10	7 0	11 0	3 6	3 7	3 6	2 4	2 10	2 5	1864
1870	0 9	2 0	1 2	8 5	—	8 5	3 11	1 9	3 10	2 8	2 7	2 8	1870
Average	5 8	5 1	5 7	12 2	14 7	12 4	4 3	4 4	4 3	2 10	2 11	2 10	
Cavalry of the Line.													
1840	5 10	5 3	5 8	8 11	11 5	9 5	4 11	13 3	5 10	2 5	2 10	2 6	1840
1846	5 10	6 0	5 11	9 1	12 1	9 7	5 1	12 6	5 8	2 7	4 11	2 8	1846
1852	3 7	4 4	3 10	9 1	10 10	9 5	4 11	10 11	5 5	2 4	3 0	2 5	1852
1858	4 0	4 6	4 3	8 3	8 9	8 5	4 5	6 8	5 0	2 1	2 4	2 2	1858
1864	3 6	3 1	3 5	6 6	7 3	6 8	3 9	5 8	4 2	2 1	1 11	2 0	1864
1870	4 4	1 3	4 0	7 6	8 2	7 7	4 1	5 4	4 3	2 5	3 0	2 6	1870
Average	4 6	4 6	4 6	8 2	9 4	8 5	4 6	7 8	5 0	2 4	2 7	2 5	
Infantry of the Line.													
1840	5 8	8 0	6 6	9 7	15 11	11 6	5 10	12 9	7 10	3 1	3 9	3 4	1840
1846	5 11	7 0	6 4	9 5	14 6	11 1	5 8	12 0	7 6	2 10	3 4	3 0	1846
1852	4 5	6 6	5 3	8 10	12 9	10 2	5 7	9 6	6 2	2 7	3 1	2 10	1852
1858	3 5	4 8	4 4	8 5	9 10	9 3	4 11	6 7	5 8	2 3	1 11	2 1	1858
1864	3 9	4 2	4 0	7 8	3 10	8 4	4 9	6 1	5 4	2 5	2 1	2 4	1864
1870	4 10	5 11	5 5	9 5	10 4	9 8	5 6	6 10	5 11	2 10	2 5	2 8	1870
Average	4 9	5 7	5 3	8 11	11 2	9 11	5 4	8 1	6 4	2 8	2 8	2 8	

Foot Guards.

Year.	Service as Regimental Major.			Service as Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel.			Service as Lieutenant and Captain.			Service as Ensign and Lieutenant.			Year.
	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	When Promotion was purchased.	When Promotion was not purchased.	All Officers.	
	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	
1840	2 1	7 11	4 0	16 10	17 9	17 1	10 1	12 7	10 6	5 0	4 2	4 11	1840
1846	3 0	4 7	3 6	15 0	14 9	14 11	10 10	15 8	11 3	5 0	4 3	5 0	1846
1852	4 10	—	4 10	15 10	17 6	16 0	10 3	—	10 3	4 9	5 4	4 9	1852
1858	—	0 4	0 4	14 8	9 10	10 5	7 9	8 6	8 0	3 10	3 3	3 9	1858
1864	—	2 8	2 8	—	7 11	7 11	5 11	8 1	6 7	4 0	3 7	3 11	1864
1870	—	3 1	3 1	12 9	10 8	10 11	7 3	7 5	7 3	3 8	4 0	3 8	1870
Average	3 6	2 9	3 1	15 9	11 0	13 0	8 10	9 5	8 11	4 5	3 10	4 4	

APP. C.

2. From the above averages of service in the several ranks, it appears that the ranks were attained by purchase and non-purchase officers taken together after the following total terms of service:

Year.	Service on attaining rank of				Year.
	Lieut.-Col.	Major.	Captain.	Lieut.	
Household Cavalry.					
	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	Y. M.	
1840	24 6	17 1	7 2	2 11	1840
1846	30 0	21 11	8 2	3 3	1846
1852	33 0	23 11	8 1	3 4	1852
1858	27 6	22 2	7 4	2 10	1858
1864	19 10	16 11	5 11	2 5	1864
1870	16 1	14 11	6 6	2 8	1870
Average	24 8	19 5	7 1	2 10	
Cavalry of the Line.					
1840	23 5	17 9	8 4	2 6	1840
1846	23 10	17 11	8 4	2 8	1846
1852	21 1	17 3	7 10	2 5	1852
1858	19 10	15 7	7 2	2 2	1858
1864	16 3	12 10	6 2	2 0	1864
1870	18 4	14 4	6 9	2 6	1870
Average	20 4	15 10	7 5	2 5	
Infantry of the Line.					
1840	29 2	22 8	11 2	3 4	1840
1846	27 11	21 7	10 6	3 0	1846
1852	24 5	19 2	9 0	2 10	1852
1858	21 4	17 0	7 9	2 1	1858
1864	20 0	16 0	7 8	2 4	1864
1870	23 8	18 3	8 7	2 8	1870
Average	23 6	18 11	9 0	2 8	
Foot Guards.					
1840	36 6	32 6	15 5	4 11	1840
1846	34 8	31 2	16 3	5 0	1846
1852	35 10	31 0	15 0	4 9	1852
1858	22 6	22 2	11 9	3 9	1858
1864	21 1	18 5	10 6	3 11	1864
1870	24 11	21 10	10 11	3 8	1870
Average	29 4	26 3	13 3	4 4	

3. These figures show at six periods, separated by intervals of six years, the average service in each rank after which the officers then serving had obtained their steps. The experience afforded by any particular officer may, therefore, have been repeated once or more. The earlier steps which are included were, in many cases, obtained before 1840, when the period of 30 years commences. The average given does not show the average promotion of the 30 years; but the average promotion during those or earlier years which the officers serving on the 1st January in 1840, 1846, 1852, 1858, 1864, and 1870, respectively, had obtained.

By striking out any steps obtained before 1840, and by inserting the experience afforded by officers who were promoted during the six-year intervals, but failed to serve long enough to be included in the return for the next period, it would be practicable to make an exact average of *every* promotion during the 30 years; but such an operation would require a considerable time.

War Office, 9th December 1874.

Denham Robinson.
Robert Davey.

APPENDIX D.

COMPARATIVE TABLES showing the NUMBER of OFFICERS who had entered upon EACH YEAR of SERVICE in EACH RANK in the INFANTRY REGIMENTS formerly under the PURCHASE SYSTEM [1st to 100th Foot, and Rifle Brigade] on the 1st November 1871, and on the 1st July 1875.

PART I.—1st November 1871.

Rank	Year in Rank	Year of Total Service entered upon. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	—	Average completed service in rank
Lieutenant-Colonels.	17	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	
	16	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	
	15	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	
	14	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	1	3	1	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	11	
	13	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	
	12	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	5	
	11	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	
	10	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	2	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	
	9	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	6	
	8	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	1	1	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	8	
	7	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	
	6	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	2	1	2	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	10	
	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	2	2	.	3	.	.	3	2	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	17	
	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	2	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	11	
	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	1	1	.	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	17	
	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	1	1	1	.	1	2	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	12	
	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	.	.	2	1	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	16	
		.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	2	4	5	6	6	6	4	7	3	11	9	16	9	9	7	8	8	4	2	1	1	4	.	2	1	137	Average completed service in rank, $5\frac{10}{12}$ years.
		Average total service completed, $27\frac{10}{12}$.																																									
Majors.	17	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	
	16	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	15	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	2	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	6	
	14	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	2	1	.	.	1	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	9	
	13	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	
	12	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	
	11	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	
	10	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	
	9	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	2	1	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9	
	8	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	2	.	2	.	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	.	.	.	3	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	20	
	7	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	.	2	.	1	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	17	
	6	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	4	3	3	4	3	.	2	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	22	
	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	2	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	27	
	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	6	3	2	5	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	32	
	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	4	5	2	1	.	2	2	2	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	25	
	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	8	1	9	2	1	5	2	1	4	2	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	40	
	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	1	1	1	7	8	6	8	3	.	4	1	1	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	46	
		.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	17	32	21	25	22	4	22	15	21	24	11	9	7	8	3	3	6	.	.	1	2	1	.	.	.	.	268	Average completed service in rank, $4\frac{7}{12}$ years.
		Average total service completed, $22\frac{1}{12}$.																																									

Captains.

| Year in Rank. | Year of Total Service entered upon. | | |

PART 2.—1st JULY 1875.

| Year in Rank. | Year of Total Service entered upon. | | |

PART 2. (*continued*).—1st July 1875.

Captains.

| Year in Rank. | Year of Total Service entered upon. | | |

ABSTRACT OF AVERAGES. APP. D.

	Average completed service in the rank in which the officers were serving.		Average total service completed.	
	1871.	1875.	1871.	1875.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
Lieut.-Colonels	$5\frac{10}{12}$	$4\frac{1}{12}$	$27\frac{10}{12}$	$28\frac{6}{12}$
Majors	$4\frac{7}{12}$	4	$21\frac{7}{12}$	$23\frac{7}{12}$
Captains	$6\frac{2}{12}$	$6\frac{7}{12}$	$14\frac{8}{12}$	$16\frac{6}{12}$
Lieutenants	$4\frac{3}{12}$	$4\frac{10}{12}$	$8\frac{10}{12}$	$7\frac{3}{12}$
Ensigns	$2\frac{10}{12}$	—	$2\frac{7}{12}$	—
Sub-Lieutenants	—	$1\frac{7}{12}$	—	$1\frac{7}{12}$

September 1875.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
ROBERT DAVEY.

APPENDIX E. APP. E.

REPORT ON THE COST AND EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT REGULATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT. [NORMAL.]

QUESTION FOR THE WAR OFFICE ACTUARIES.

What would be the probable effect on promotion if the existing warrants, &c. were continued in force, and what would be the cost involved, supposing the Army to be in a normal condition?

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 99.)

The following are the bases which we have assumed for our calculation:—

1. Succession to 275 General Officers to be secured to the British colonels of Guards and Line.
2. Honorary colonelcies as now.
3. Retired full pay—
   Artillery, Engineers } under warrant of 5th July 1872.
   Cavalry, Infantry } under warrant of 27th December 1870.
4. Half-pay for all arms after 25 years' service, without limit.
5. "Five-years' rule" applied to lieutenant-colonels and majors of cavalry and infantry.
6. Indian Staff Corps to provide 95 vacancies annually for subalterns.

I.—PRINCIPLES OF CALCULATION.

1. The rules for promotion and retirement, as now existing, are briefly shown in § 4 under the several arms. In many cases, voluntary elements come in, as to which we have had to make arbitrary assumptions; and, in some, where amalgamation with Indian cadres is at present incomplete, we have had to assume that certain changes would have been made when the corps attained a normal state. These assumptions are also explained fully.

In order to arrive at a probable mean result in Non-Effective expenditure, promotion, and value to the officer, we have calculated the effects of the system to which Government now stands committed on two outside hypotheses. First, we have supposed an extreme desire to retire; to the extent that all officers retire as soon as they have earned retirement, if they be not clearly required, to keep the upper ranks full. This represents the largest expenditure combined with the most rapid promotion which could reasonably occur. The second hypothesis is that officers will serve up to the compulsory age (where there is one) for retirement, except in those cases where the Present Value of the retired pension clearly exceeds the value of the prospects in the service. This shows, in like manner, the least non-effective cost, the smallest number of officers on retirement, and the slowest promotion, to which the existing rules commit the Government.

The mean of these two statements will perhaps not be far from the actual operation of the present rules; and in this Report the results given by us show that mean, unless the contrary be stated. Tables A. and B. at the end of the report give full details under the above extremes.

In the calculations we have assumed that as officers cannot quit the army under 25 years' service with a pension, they will resign without pension to the same extent that that they have so resigned in the 10 years, 1861–70, in the Royal Artillery. These resignations extend only to 19 years' service; thus leaving a period of six years without resignations before paid retirement operates. Lest this assumption should be thought excessive, we show in Tables A. 1 and B. 1 the variation in results caused by the entire omission of resignation.

2. In the absence of the Purchase System, we have not seen any rule to guide us in making a distinction in the proportion of officers who served continuously until retirement or promotion to general officer in the Guards as compared to the Line. We have therefore treated the whole of the cavalry and infantry as serving under similar conditions in regard to the propensity of the officers to seek early or late retirement. We have assumed that the appointments as general officer will fall to each corps in proportion to the lieutenant-colonels completing qualifying service for the rank. As regards the retired full-pay establishment we have also supposed it to be open to each corps of Guards and Line in proportion to the officers in each who have an interest in accepting it, *i.e.*, to those to whom the Present Value of the retirement is of greater value than the prospects of continued service.

3. Although it is not an invariable rule, we have assumed that in practice the officers of each corps will have the right of succession to the honorary colonelcies of those corps. Our reason for this course was the difference in value of the honorary colonelcies in the several corps.

4. *Household Cavalry.*—The officers of these regiments have the right to go to half-pay after 25 years' service; or to retired full pay, if there be a vacancy, after 30 years' service. As a matter of fact, an officer's prospects are such that he is unlikely to accept retired full pay.

The "five years' rule" operates for lieutenant-colonel, but not under seniority promotion for major: the number of lieutenant-colonels being equal to that of majors.

Officers who have not previously accepted half-pay would have to quit the regiment at 60 years of age, on 1*l.* a day, with right of promotion to a vacancy among the major-generals.

There are three honorary colonelcies, each worth 1,800*l.* a year.

Cavalry of the Line.—The retirements are—

Voluntary to half-pay after 25 years' service.
" to retired full-pay after 30 years' service, subject to a vacancy.
[It is worth the while of a major removed by the "five years' rule" to accept this retirement: but not of a lieutenant-colonel.]

APP. E.

Compulsory withdrawal to half-pay after five years as major.

Compulsory withdrawal to half-pay after five years as lieutenant-colonel.

Compulsory withdrawal on full pay at the age of 60, with right of succession to major-general.

There will be 28 honorary colonelcies, of 1,000*l.* a year each.

Foot Guards and Infantry of the Line.—Voluntary retirement after 25 years' service to half-pay.

Voluntary retirement after 30 years' service, if there be a vacancy, to retired full pay.

[Worth acceptance by a major of Foot Guards and by both lieutenant-colonel and major of the Line.]

Compulsory withdrawal to half-pay after five years' service as major.

Compulsory withdrawal to half-pay after five years' service as lieutenant-colonel.

Compulsory withdrawal on full pay at the age of 60, with right of succession to major-general.

The Guards have three honorary colonelcies averaging 2,067*l.*; and the infantry 114 at 1,000*l.* each.

It will be observed that our calculations show a remarkably slow promotion in the Foot Guards as compared with other arms. This is due to the very small proportion of field officers. That proportion has hitherto had reference to a state of things in which every captain was virtually a lieutenant-colonel: but in calculating for a normal army we have supposed the warrant of 25th June 1872 cancelling all double rank in the Guards, to be in full operation. In practice, the loss of the double rank will probably be followed by the grant of a better proportion of field officers; but we have only had the present establishment to work upon.

Royal Artillery.—The rates of pay, retirement and honorary colonelcy, we have taken as the average given by the British horse and foot brigades.

The honorary colonelcy is thus worth 1,010*l.* and we have taken that amount for the whole 28 colonels commandant, although at present 12 of them belong to Indian cadres, and draw Indian rates of pay.

There is no compulsory retirement; but optional retirement to half-pay after 25 years' service, or to full pay (to the limit of an establishment) after 30 years on 365*l.* as a lieutenant-colonel, or 489*l.* (average) as a regimental colonel. After 40 years' service, any colonel or general officer may retire, without limitation, on 600*l.* a year.

The warrant of 1872 fixes 42,400*l.* as the establishment of retired full pay for the British "List"; but as, in the normal, this list will have to be expanded so as to absorb the three Indian lists, we have assumed that a proportional establishmant of retired full pay will be given of 69,470*l.*

In calculating Table A. [earliest retirement], we thought it too great an assumption to suppose that artillery officers after 25 years' service would accept half-pay of 212*l.* a year, when by serving only five years more, this superior retirement of 489*l.* was open to them. We therefore assumed, in calculating early retirement, that the limited retired full pay of 69,470*l.*, would be always kept full; and that only those whom it could not receive would accept the half-pay.

Royal Engineers.—The honorary colonelcies (17 in number) are worth 990*l.* a year; and the retired full pay of a colonel is 474*l.* 10*s.*

In all other respects, the observations under the Royal Artillery apply also to the Royal Engineers; the 42,400*l.* of the Artillery corresponds, in the Engineers, to 21,500*l.* which, for the same reason as in the Artillery, we have assumed to be raised to 42,140*l.*

II.—Numbers.

5. The establishments of officers with which we have to deal are detailed below. These numbers show the whole body of officers of regimental ranks in military or quasi-military employment, both on the British and Indian establishments, in accordance with a table already furnished to the commission by the Accountant-General. Supernumerary and seconded officers we have treated as forming, for promotion purposes, part of the actual rank. These numbers are not in absolute accordance with the establishments of 1875–6, but the differences are not great; and we have retained them in order that comparison may be easier with other calculations made for the Royal Commission.

Regimental Ranks.

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of the Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.	Total.
Colonels	—	—	—	—	69	38	107
Lieutenant-colonels [a]	4[a]	42[a]	5[a]	226[a]	157	104	538
Majors	3	34	7[b]	296	259	154	753
Captains	24	222	71	1,492	335	186	2,330
Subalterns	39	405	147	2,645	573	368	4,177
Total	70	703	230	4,659	1,393	850	7,905

[a] The lieutenant-colonelcies of brigade depôts and on the staff have been thus assigned, being in proportion (excluding fractions) to the lieutenant-colonels in the several arms.

Household cavalry	1
Cavalry	14
Foot Guards	2
Infantry	76
	93

[b] The three majors granted in 1875 have been added, as having considerable effect in the promotion in a small corps.

6. As promotion is dependent on the proportion between the ranks (retirement, &c. being equal) we show the numbers in § 5 reduced to a percentage.

Regimental Ranks (as a percentage).

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of the Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Colonels	—	—	—	—	5	5
Lieutenant-colonels	6	6	2	5	11	12
Majors	4	5	3	7	19	18
Captains	34	32	31	35	24	22
Subalterns	56	57	64	53[a]	41	43
	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a] The proportion of subalterns would appear larger, if the actual number serving were taken into account; but we have deducted 388 as the number for whom the Indian Staff Corps will provide promotion.

7. The proportion borne by the upper to the lower ranks in the Artillery and Engineers is such as to give them a better *proportional* movement through the regimental ranks than is possessed by the Guards and Line; but the *actual* movement depends in a very large degree upon the exits from the top of the regimental ranks. These exits are provided in the Guards and Line by the "five years' rule," and the forced retirement at 60; provisions not extended to the Artillery and Engineers. Consequently, unless the inducement to voluntary retirement be considerable, officers of these corps may be expected to continue on the regimental roll until promotion to major-general.

In the Guards and Line the lieutenant-colonels passing to half-pay after five years' service, or to full pay at 60 years of age, can remain on an unattached list until they succeed to the general officers' establishment. Such unattached lieutenant-colonels virtually constitute a grade between the general officers and the regimental officers; and form, with the former, the measure of promotion open to the regimental officers.

Viewed in this light we estimate that there would be, in a normal state, the following officers not retired from the service above the regimental officers:—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of the Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
General officers	4½[a]	40[a]	8½[a]	222[a]	58	34
Unattached field officers	9	77	21	449	—	—
Total, above regimental officers	13½	117	29½	671	58	34

[a] The general officers assigned to each arm of cavalry and infantry are proportioned to the lieutenant-colonels estimated to qualify for the rank of general officer, making up the total of 275.

Referred to a basis of 100 officers of regimental ranks in

each arm (including supernumeraries) these figures stands thus,—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
General officers	6	6	4	5	4	3
Unattached field officers	13	11	9	11	—	—
Total (not on retired list) above 100 regimental officers	19	17	13	16	4	3

8. In § 7 is shown the proportion in the several arms borne by the sources of promotion within the regiment, which the general officers and the unattached officers who are awaiting the rank of major-general represent. Additional sources are furnished by retirement. Taking the mean between voluntary and compulsory retirement, working to their respective extremes (as shown in Tables A. and B.) there would have to be added :—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Retired as colonels or lieutenant-colonels	Nil.	11	4	77	543	335
Retired as majors	Nil.	8	7	269	Nil.	Nil.
Retired as captains	17	157	66	707	Nil.	Nil.
	17	176	77	1,053	543	335

As a percentage on the officers of regimental ranks these give, as an addition to the percentage in § 7.

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Retired as colonels or lieutenant-colonels	Nil.	2	2	2	39	39
Retired as majors	Nil.	1	3	6	—	—
Retired as captains	24	22	29	17	—	—
Total retired per cent.	24	25	34	25	39	39

9. It follows by adding the percentage in §§ 7 and 8 together that for every 100 effective officers of regimental ranks (including supernumeraries) there are in all, outside the regiment in the upper ranks, active and retired, the following as a motive power towards promotion :—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Total per cent. to give promotion to regimental ranks	43	42	47	41	43	42

The money in the Estimates represented by thsse retirements for every 100 officers of the regimental ranks, (supernumeraries included) varies with the rates of retirement, &c. available, and is—

Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry and W. I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
£ 16,150	£ 12,280	£ 12,340	£ 11,550	£ 16,320	£ 16,350

III.—Promotion.

10. Having now stated the numbers of effectives with which we have to work, and the value of the non-effective list as an aid to promotion, we show the result in promotion as brought out in our calculations.

In Table A. (Earliest retirement and quick promotion.

	Service in each Rank (in Years).					
	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Subaltern	14	15	15½	13½	9½	10
Captain	11	10	9½	11½	7	6½
Major	5	5	5	5	6	5½
Lieutenant-colonel	5	5	5	5	6½	6½
Colonel (regimental)	5(a)	5(a)	5(a)	5(a)	11	11½
Colonel (unattached)	6	6	6	6	—	—
General officer (unattached)	5	4	5	6½	8½	8

(a) Brigade Depôt or on Staff.

In Table B. (Latest retirement and slow promotion.)

	Service in each Rank (in Years).					
	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Subaltern	19	20	22½	18	14	14
Captain	14½	14½	14½	15½	10	9½
Major	2	2	2	3½	8½	8½
Lieutenant-colonel	3½	3½	1	3	5½	6
Colonel (regimental)	—	—	—	—	7	6
Colonel (unattached)	15	15½	15½	15½	—	—
General officer (unattached)	2	2½	7½	4	7	7

As regards the artillery and engineers, we think that Table B. shows the probable working ; but, as regards the Guards and Line, slowness of promotion is pushed to so extreme a point that some re-organization would obviously have occurred before such a state of inefficiency could be reached. We have, by the hypothesis, been obliged to allow lieutenant-colonels to become general officers who had not had the qualifying service of five years ; and we have had to treat the extra-regimental lieutenant-colonelcies as held by lieutenant-colonels of the same amount of service as, but additional to, those in regiments.

As a more probable result (except in the artillery and engineers) the two following tables show the mean promotion between Tables A. and B.

Mean of Tables A. and B. (Service.)

	Service in each Rank (in Years).					
	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Subaltern	16½	17½	19	15½	11½	12
Captain	12½	12½	12	13½	8½	8
Major	3½	3½	3½	4½	7½	7
Lieutenant-colonel	4½	4½	3	4	6	6½
Colonel (regimental)	2½(b)	2½(b)	2½(b)	2½(b)	9	8½
Colonel (unattached)	10½	10½	10½	10½	—	—
General officer (unattached)	3½	3½	6½	5½	7½	7½

(b) Brigade depôt or on staff.

Mean of Tables A. and B. (Age.)

	Age on attaining Rank.					
	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of the Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of the Line.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Subaltern	20	20	20	20	20	20
Captain	36½	37½	39	35½	31½	32
Major	49½	49½	51	49½	40½	40
Lieutenant-colonel	52½	53½	54½	53½	47½	47
Colonel (regimental)	57	57½	57½	57½	53½	53½
Colonel (unattached)	59½	60	60	60	—	—
Major-general	70	70½	70½	70½	62½	62½
Honorary colonel	73½	74	77	76	70½	70

For comparison with these mean results, we show below

APP. E.

the average age on promotion, under the purchase system, for 30 years' before the abolition of purchase in the Guards and Line; and, as regards artillery and engineers, the age on the 1st Jan. 1875. In each case, to make the comparison complete, we assume entry at the age of 20 (probably 2 years in excess as regards Guards and Line).

Past Experience (with entry at 20).

	Age on attaining the Rank.				
	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of the Line.	Infantry of the Line.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Subaltern	20	20	20	20	20
Captain	27	27⅞	29	33½	32½
Major	39½	35¾	39	39¾	37½
Lieutenant-colonel	44¾	40½	43½	44½	45
Colonel	—	—	—	51½	51¼

IV.—Cost of Retirement.

11. With the assumed action of retirement respectively at the earliest and latest ages, the total non-effective cost to which the country stands committed, would be in a normal state, as follows (honorary colonelcies being treated as non-effective charge).

	Table A. Early Retirement.	Table B. Late Retirement.	Mean of Tables A. and B.	Mean Charge for Non-effective per Effective Officer.
	£	£	£	£
Household Cavalry	12,151	10,816	11,483	166
Cavalry of the Line	93,239	82,747	87,993	127
Foot Guards	30,194	26,866	28,530	123
Infantry of the Line and West India Regiments	530,466	471,655	501,060	119
Artillery	257,707	197,017	227,362	163
Engineers	156,467	121,307	138,887	163
Total	1,080,224	910,408	995,315	134

12. The non-effective charge shown in § 11 will be that for the combatant ranks of the whole army, with the exception of the Indian Staff Corps. A portion, however, of the charge will fall upon India, the payment depending on each retired officer's service in India, and being therefore proportioned to the number of officers serving in India and out of India respectively.

The normal charge which will fall upon the British Exchequer (based upon the effectives shown in the army estimates of 1875–6 as serving in and out of India) will be as follows:— [*See top of next column.*]

	Total Mean Charge.	Percentage payable by Britain.	British Charge.	Indian Charge.
	£		£	£
Household Cavalry	11,483	100	11,483	Nil.
Cavalry of Line	87,993	70½	62,030	25,963
Foot Guards	28,530	100	28,530	Nil.
Infantry of Line and West India Regiments	501,060	69	345,700	155,360
Artillery	227,362	58	132,000	95,362
Engineers	138,887	47½	66,100	72,787
Total	995,315	65	645,843	349,472

13. The present non-effective charge is roughly as follows:—

	£
Honorary colonelcies	208,500
General officers, unattached	88,500
Retired full pay	139,039
Half pay	140,968
Estimated half pay of officers who have commuted or sold half pay	53,150
	£630,157

To make this compare with the 995,315*l.* in §12, it would be necessary to add the charge which falls upon India for the retired pay of officers of Indian artillery, Indian engineers, and of the 18th to 21st hussars and 101st to 109th foot. This charge we have no means of knowing.

14. In estimating the present non-effective charge we have not included the rewards of officers (21,500*l.*); as we do not know whether there is any intention of merging that sum in the other retirements. For the same reason it has been omitted from the estimated future charge.

In an army with less voluntary retirement than now obtains, it is probable that a larger charge would arise for pensions to widows and children of officers. We have no data on which to calculate this increase; and therefore have omitted the item for widows and children from the estimates both of the present and of the future non-effective charge.

V.—Value to the Officer.

15. The present value to the officer in each arm at the time of attaining each rank is shown in the following statement with reference to the other results given in Table A. (early retirements).

The results shown in Table B. (late retirements) being evidently impracticable we have not calculated the values under that system.

The values below show a slightly larger amount in the officer's favour than would be shown by values calculated on the mean of promotion and retirement given in § 10 and § 12.

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line and W.I. Regiments.	Artillery.	Engineers.
Present Value (4 per cent.) of future prospects to every Officer on attaining Rank of—	£	£	£	£	£	£
Subaltern	3,688	3,319	2,874	2,717	3,505	3,321
Captain	4,192	3,827	3,676	3,416	4,400	4,270
Major	7,083	5,215	5,545	4,046	4,655	4,506
Lieutenant-colonel	6,626	5,122	6,677	4,509	4,343	4,317
Major-general	8,947	5,915	10,014	5,301	6,669	6,637
Annuity for Life equivalent to the Present Value (4 per cent.) on attaining Rank of—						
Subaltern	212	190	166	156	201	191
Captain	264	243	234	214	265	258
Major	512	377	401	292	300	291
Lieutenant-colonel	528	408	532	359	302	298
Major-general	1,140	756	1,277	676	684	681

16. The several results are collected in Tables A. and B.: and the variations which would occur if no voluntary resignation took place in the Guards and Line, under 25 years' service, are shown in the Sub-Tables A. 1, and B. 1.

28th June 1875.

Denham Robinson.
Robert Davey.

APP. E.

TABLE A.—EARLY RETIREMENT.

On the assumptions that, prior to becoming entitled to half pay, officers resign at the same ratio as in the Royal Artillery; that all, who are not required to fill the ranks above, retire as captains after 25 years' service; and that full-pay service ends at 60.

Normal YEARLY Results.	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line, and W. I. Regiments.	Total Cavalry and Infantry.	Artillery.	Engineers.	Total Artillery and Engineers.	Total. All Arms.
AGE ON ATTAINING THE SEVERAL RANKS.									
1. Subaltern - - - - - - - years	20	20	20	20	—	20	20	—	—
2. Captain - - - - - - - „	34	35	35½	33½	—	29½	30	—	—
3. Major - - - - - - - „	45	45	45	45	—	36½	36½	—	—
4. Lieutenant-Colonel - - - - - „	50	50	50	50	—	42½	42	—	—
5. Colonel (regimental) - - - - - „	—	—	—	—	—	49	48½	—	—
6. Major-General - - - - - - „	66	66	66	66	—	60	60	—	—
7. Honorary Colonel - - - - - - „	71	70	71	72½	—	68½	68	—	—
Subalterns.									
8. Entering at age 20 - - - - number	3	32	11	288	334	65	40	105	439
9. Joining Indian Staff Corps - - - „	—	—	—	95	95	—	—	—	95
10. Service as subalterns - - - - years	14	15	15½	13½	—	9½	10	—	—
11. Promoted yearly - - - - number	2 4/10	23	8	143 3/10	177	53	32	85	262
Captains.									
12. Captains and subalterns resigning without compensation. number	3/10	3	1 1/10	19	23 4/10	7	4 2/10	11 2/10	34 6/10
13. Service as captain - - - - - years	11	10	9½	11½	—	7	6½	—	—
14. Promoted yearly - - - - - number	6/10	7	1 5/10	61	70 1/10	46	28½	74½	144½
15. Retiring on half-pay - - - - „	1 4/10	13	5½	59	78 9/10	—	—	—	78 9/10
16. Age on retirement - - - - - years	45	45	45	45	—	—	—	—	—
Majors.									
17. Service as major - - - - - years	5	5	5	5	—	6	5½	—	—
18. Promoted yearly - - - - - number	6/10	6	6/10	31	38 2/10	43	26 4/10	69 4/10	107 6/10
19. Retiring on full-pay - - - - „	none.	½	½	9	9½	none.	none.	none.	9½
20. Retiring on half-pay - - - - „	none.	½	½	17	18	none.	none.	none.	18
Lieut.-Colonels.									
21. Service as regimental lieut.-colonel - - years	5	5	5	5	—	6½	6½	—	—
22. Apppointed after five years to farther duties number	3/10	3	3/10	16	19 6/10	—	—	—	19 6/10
23. Retiring on full-pay - - - - „	—	—	—	8/10	8/10	—	—	—	8/10
24. Passing to half-pay as brevet-colonels for succession to general officers. „	3/10	2 4/10	3/10	12	15	—	—	—	15
25. Retiring on half-pay - - - - „	—	—	—	—	—	29	17 6/10	46 6/10	46 6/10
Colonels.									
26. Completing five years' service and passing to half-pay for succession to general officer. „	3/10	2 7/10	3/10	14	17 3/10	—	—		17 3/10
27. Retiring on full-pay - - - - „	—	—	—	—	—	7	4 3/10	11 3/10	11 3/10
28. Period on half-pay - - - - years	6	6	6	6	—	—	—	—	—
29. Promoted to major-general - - number	4/10	3 9/10	4/10	20	24 7/10	4	2 4/10	6 4/10	31 1/10
Number of Officers Non-effective.									
30. General officers: Honorary colonels - number	3	28	3	114	148	28	17	45	193
31. „ Unattached - - „	2	15	2	108	127	30	17	47	174
	5	43	5	222	275	58	34	92	367
32. Colonels on half-pay - - - number	6	51	6	269	332	none.	none.	none.	332
33. „ on retired full-pay - - „	—	—	—	—	—	146	89	235	235
34. Lieut.-colonels on retired full-pay - - „	—	—	—	14	14	none.	none.	none.	14
35. „ half-pay - - - „	—	—	—	—	—	683	420	1,103	1,103
36. Majors on retired full-pay - - - „	none.	5	5	181	191	—	—	—	191
37. „ half-pay - - - - „	none.	11	10	357	378	—	—	—	378
38. Captains on half-pay - - - - „	33	313	133	1,414	1,893	—	—	—	1,893
39. Total non-effective (including general officers) - „	44	423	159	2,457	3,083	887	543	1,430	4,513
40. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective regimental officers.	64	59	69	56	57	64	64	64	59
Cost of Non-effective List.									
41. Honorary colonelcies - - - - £	5,400	28,000	6,200	114,000	153,600	28,272	16,830	45,102	198,702
42. Unattached general officers - - - £	913	6,844	913	49,275	57,945	14,665	8,067	22,732	80,677
43. Retired full-pay - - - - £	—	1,890	2,109	58,001	62,000	69,470	42,140	111,610	173,610
44. Half-pay - - - - - - £	5,838	56,505	20,972	309,190	392,505	145,300	89,430	234,730	627,235
45. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective £	12,151	93,239	30,194	530,466	666,050	257,707	156,467	414,174	1,080,224
46. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted. [5 per cent.] - £	5,437	46,118	14,733	266,330	332,618	141,280	85,750	227,030	559,648
47. Charge for non-effective per effective officer—									
On line 45 - - - - - - £	176	135	132	127	129	185	184	185	146
On line 46 - - - - - £	79	67	65	63	64	101	101	101	75

APP. E.

TABLE A. 1.

If the Resignations assumed in the previous Table be omitted in the Cavalry and Infantry, the following alterations would occur.

Normal YEARLY Results.	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line, and W. I. Regiments.	Total Cavalry and Infantry.
2*a*. Captain, age on attaining rank - - - years	34½	35½	36	34	—
8*a*. Subalterns entering at age 20 - - number	3	29	10	272	316
10*a*. Service as subaltern - - - - years	14½	15½	16	14	—
11*a*. Subalterns promoted yearly - - number	2½	24	8 3/10	146	180 3/10
12*a*. Captains and subalterns resigning without compensation - - - - - number	none.	none.	none.	none.	—
13*a*. Service as captains - - - - years	10½	9½	9	11	—
15*a*. Captains retiring on half-pay - - number	1½	14 3/10	6	66	87 3/10
38*a*. Captains on half-pay - - - number	36	341	142	1,581	2,100
40*a*. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective regimental officers - - - number	65	62	73	60	61
44*a*. Cost of half-pay - - - - - £	6,198	60,254	22,285	332,030	420,767
45*a*. Total non-effective charge - - - £	12,511	96,988	31,507	533,306	694,312
46*a*. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted at 5 per cent. - - £	5,623	48,063	15,409	268,160	337,255
47*a*. Charge for non-effective per effective officer on line 45*a* £	181	141	138	132	134
„ „ on line 46*a* -	81	70	68	64	65
Present Value on attaining Rank of—					
Subaltern - - - - - - - £	3,713	3,335	2,916	2,765	—
Captain - - - - - - - -	4,113	3,750	3,599	3,366	—
Annuity for Life equivalent to present Value on attaining Rank of—					
Subaltern - - - - - - £	212	191	168	159	—
Captain - - - - - - -	261	239	231	211	—

TABLE B.—Late Retirement.

On the assumption that officers, prior to becoming entitled to half pay, resign at the same ratio as in the Royal Artillery; and that all serve as long as the Regulations will admit, or until the retired full pay becomes of more value than the prospects in the service.

Normal Yearly Results.	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line, and W. I. Regiments.	Total Cavalry and Infantry.	Artillery.	Engineers.	Total Artillery and Engineers.	Grand Total.
Age on attaining the several Ranks.									
1. Subaltern - - - - - - years	20	20	20	20	—	20	20	—	—
2. Captain - - - - - - „	39	40	$42\frac{1}{2}$	38	—	34	34	—	—
3. Major - - - - - - „	$54\frac{1}{2}$	$54\frac{1}{2}$	57	$53\frac{1}{2}$	—	44	$43\frac{1}{2}$	—	—
4. Lieutenant-Colonel - - - - „	$56\frac{1}{2}$	$56\frac{1}{2}$	59	57	—	$52\frac{1}{2}$	52	—	—
5. Colonel (regimental) - - - - „	—	—	—	—	—	58	58	—	—
6. Major-General - - - - „	75	$75\frac{1}{2}$	$75\frac{1}{2}$	$75\frac{1}{2}$	—	65	64	—	—
7. Honorary Colonel - - - - „	77	78	83	$79\frac{1}{2}$	—	72	71	—	—
Subalterns.									
8. Entering at age 20 - - - - number	$2\frac{5}{10}$	$24\frac{7}{10}$	$8\frac{1}{10}$	249	$284\frac{3}{10}$	$48\frac{1}{10}$	$29\frac{4}{10}$	$77\frac{5}{10}$	$361\frac{8}{10}$
9. Joining Indian Staff Corps - - - „	—	—	—	95	95	—	—	—	95
10. Service as subaltern - - - - years	19	20	$22\frac{1}{2}$	18	—	14	14	—	—
11. Promoted yearly - - - - - number	$1\frac{7}{10}$	$16\frac{9}{10}$	$5\frac{3}{10}$	105	$128\frac{9}{10}$	$36\frac{1}{10}$	$22\frac{1}{10}$	$58\frac{2}{10}$	$187\frac{1}{10}$
Captains.									
12. Captains and subalterns resigning without compensation - - - - - number	$\frac{2}{10}$	$2\frac{2}{10}$	$\frac{7}{10}$	$13\frac{4}{10}$	$16\frac{5}{10}$	$5\frac{6}{10}$	3	$8\frac{6}{10}$	$25\frac{1}{10}$
13. Service as captain - - - - years	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$15\frac{1}{2}$	—	10	$9\frac{1}{2}$	—	—
14. Promoted yearly - - - - - number	$1\frac{4}{10}$	$13\frac{8}{10}$	$4\frac{3}{10}$	85	$104\frac{5}{10}$	31	$19\frac{1}{10}$	$50\frac{1}{10}$	$154\frac{6}{10}$
15. Retiring on half pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.
16. Age on retirement - - - - years	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Majors.									
17. Service as major - - - - years	2	2	2	$3\frac{1}{2}$	—	$8\frac{1}{2}$	$8\frac{1}{2}$	—	—
18. Promoted yearly - - - - number	$1\frac{3}{10}$	$13\frac{3}{10}$	$4\frac{1}{10}$	80	$98\frac{7}{10}$	$27\frac{7}{10}$	17	$44\frac{7}{10}$	$143\frac{4}{10}$
19. Retiring on full pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.
20. Retiring on half pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.
Lieutenant-Colonels.									
21. Service as regimental lieutenant-colonel - - years	$3\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$	1	3	—	$5\frac{1}{2}$	6	—	—
22. Appointed after 5 years to further duties - number	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.
23. Retiring on full pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.
24. Passing to temporary retired full pay as brevet colonels for succession to general officers - „	$1\frac{2}{10}$	$12\frac{2}{10}$	4	74	$91\frac{4}{10}$	—	—	—	$91\frac{4}{10}$
25. Retiring on half pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	none
Colonels.									
26. Completing 5 years' service and passing to half pay for succession to general officer - - number	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27. Retiring on full pay - - - - „	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.	$17\frac{8}{10}$	$11\frac{2}{10}$	29	29
28. Period on temporary retired full pay - - years	15	$15\frac{1}{2}$	$15\frac{1}{2}$	$15\frac{1}{2}$	—	—	—	—	—
29. Promoted to major-general - - - number	$\frac{6}{10}$	$5\frac{3}{10}$	$1\frac{7}{10}$	$32\frac{4}{10}$	40	5	$2\frac{9}{10}$	$7\frac{9}{10}$	$47\frac{0}{10}$
Number of Officers Non-effective.									
30. General officers: Honorary colonels - - -	3	28	3	114	148	28	17	45	193
31. „ Unattached - - - -	1	9	9	108	127	30	17	47	174
	4	37	12	222	275	58	34	92	367
32. Colonels on half pay - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
33. „ on retired full pay - - - -	14	139	45	845	1,043	257	161	418	1,461
34. Lieutenant-colonels retired full pay - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
35. „ half pay - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
36. Majors retired full pay - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
37. „ half pay - - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
38. Captains half pay - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
39. Total non-effective (including general officers) - -	18	176	57	1,067	1,318	315	195	510	1,828
40. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective regimental officers.	26	26	25	25	25	23	23	23	25

APP. E.

TABLE B.—(*continued.*)

Normal YEARLY Results.	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line, and W. I. Regiments.	Total Cavalry and Infantry.	Artillery.	Engineers.	Total Artillery and Engineers.	Grand Total.
Cost of Non-effective List.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
41. Honorary colonelcies	5,400	28,000	6,200	114,000	153,600	28,272	16,830	45,102	198,702
42. Unattached general officers	456	4,107	4,107	49,275	57,945	14,665	8,067	22,732	80,677
43. Retired full pay	4,960	50,642	16,559	308,380	380,539	154,080	96,410	250,490	631,029
44. Half pay	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective	10,816	82,747	26,866	471,655	592,084	197,017	121,307	318,324	910,408
46. Total annual charge for non-effective, if all *non-effective* pay be commuted. [5 per cent.]	3,968	33,920	10,470	188,100	236,458	122,110	75,740	197,850	434,308
47. Charge for non-effective per effective officer—									
On line 45	155	118	114	110	112	141	143	142	121
On line 46	56	48	46	44	45	88	89	88	—

TABLE B. 1.

If the Resignations assumed in the previous Table be omitted in the Cavalry and Infantry, the following alterations would occur.

2*a*. Captain, age on attaining rank	years	$39\frac{1}{2}$	$40\frac{1}{2}$	43	$39\frac{1}{2}$	—			
8*a*. Subalterns entering at age 20	number	$2\frac{9}{10}$	$22\frac{3}{10}$	$7\frac{3}{10}$	234	$265\frac{8}{10}$			
10*a*. Service as subaltern	years	$19\frac{1}{2}$	$20\frac{1}{2}$	23	$19\frac{1}{2}$	—			
11*a*. Subalterns promoted yearly	number	$1\frac{8}{10}$	$17\frac{5}{10}$	$5\frac{5}{10}$	108	$132\frac{8}{10}$			
12*a*. Captains and subalterns resigning without compensation	number	none.	none.	none.	none.	none.			
13*a*. Service as captains	years	15	14	$14\frac{1}{2}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	—			
32*a*. Colonels on non-effective pay	number	14	146	48	890	1,098			
40*a*. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective regimental officers	number	26	27	26	26	26			
44*a*. Cost of non-effective pay of colonels	£	4,960	53,330	17,460	325,000	400,750			
45*a*. Total non-effective charge	£	10,816	93,819	30,505	539,155	674,295			
47*a*. Charge for non-effective per effective officer	£	155	119	133	126	128			

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO TABLES A. AND B.

Line 1. The assumption is made that lieutenants enter in each arm at the age of 20, and count service for retirement from that age.

„ 2 & 9. The quicker promotion to the rank of captain in the infantry of the line is partly attributable to the relief afforded by the annual exit of 95 subalterns to the Indian Staff Corps. As very few go from other arms we have assumed all as passing from the infantry. This agrees with our former calculations.

„ 12. Calculated on the experience, for each year of service, given by the artillery during the 10 years, 1861–70.

„ 15. In Table A. all captains are supposed to accept half-pay retirement for whom the body of majors (with 5 years' service as such) do not provide promotion. In Table B. the hypothesis excludes such retirement.

„ 17. In Table A. the majors (who survive) serve to the five years' limit fixed by regulation. In Table B. they cannot do so, as there do not remain 10 years from the time of promotion to major to that of forced retirement as lieutenant-colonel at the age of 60.

„ 22. This refers to appointments to brigade depôts and staff. We have assumed that the appointments will be for five years, and that they will not extend beyond 60 years of age. The line does not occur in Table B., as from the close approach to 60 of officers when they became lieutenant-colonels it was necessary to promote officers from majors to these appointments.

„ 24 & 26. In Table B., as officers will only thus pass to non-effective pay as lieutenant-colonels on completing 60 years of age, they will go to temporary retired full pay of 365*l.* a year. Those in Table A. have only the unattached pay of 200*l.* 15*s.*

TABLE SHEWING THE PROPORTIONS OF THE SEVERAL RANKS OF INFANTRY OF THE LINE, INCLUSIVE OF WEST INDIA REGIMENTS AND EXCLUSIVE OF NON-PURCHASE INDIAN REGIMENTS, ON THE 1ST JULY 1875, THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN EACH RANK WHO REMAINED AT THAT DATE IN THE RANKS THEY HELD BEFORE PURCHASE WAS ABOLISHED, AND THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS APPOINTED OR PROMOTED SINCE THE ABOLITION OF PURCHASE.

	LIEUT COLONELS 139		MAJORS 276		CAPTAINS 1435.		LIEUTENANTS 1844.		SUB-LIEUTENANTS 410	
	Of 25 years Service & upwards	20 years Service and under 25	Holding the rank before 1st Nov 1871	Promoted to the rank since 1st Nov 1871	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st November, 1871.	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st November 1871	Appointed to the rank since 1st November 1871	
Of 25 years Service & upwards	52	55	18	36	19	"	"	"	"	Of 25 years Service & upwards
20 years Service and under 25	13	17	77	83	282	8	"	"	"	20 and under 25
15 " 20	1	1	12	17	478	115	30	"	"	15 " 20
10 " 15	"	"	2	1	219	244	405	"	"	10 " 15
under 10 years	"	"	"	"	12	28	1065	344	410	under 10 years
TOTALS	66	73	139	137	1010	425	1500	344	410	

TABLE SHEWING THE PROPORTIONS OF THE SEVERAL RANKS OF THE FOOT GUARDS ON THE 1ST JULY, 1875, THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN EACH RANK WHO REMA
THAT DATE IN THE RANKS THEY HELD BEFORE PURCHASE WAS ABOLISHED, AND THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS APPOINTED OR PROMOTED SINCE THE ABOLITION OF PU

	REG.L.T. COLONELS 3		REGIMENTAL MAJORS 7.		CAPTAINS AND LIEUT. COLONELS 71.		LIEUTENANTS AND CAPTAINS 86.		LIEUTENANTS 33.	
	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st Nov. 1871.	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st Nov. 1871.	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st Nov 1871.	Holding the rank before 1st November 1871.	Promoted to the rank since 1st November 1871.	Holding the rank before 1st Nov 1871.	Promoted to since 1st No
Of 25 years and upwards	2	1	2	4	5					
20 and under 25	"	"	"	1	23		1			
15 " 20	"	"	"	"	18	1	2			
10 " 15	"	"	"	"	5	19	10			
under 10 years	"	"	"	"	"		12	31	23	10
TOTAL.	2	1	2	5	51	20	55	31	23	10

APPENDIX F. 2.

CAVALRY OF THE LINE.

APPENDIX F.3.

HOUSEHOLD CAVALRY.

APPENDIX G.

Annual Vacancies required to secure Promotion.

Questions for the War Office Actuaries.

Assume the establishment of the Army to remain as at present.

1. What number of vacancies will be required annually in the several ranks, if promotion is to be maintained, on the average, at the rates shown in your Report No. 73 (Appendix C.) to have been those which obtained under the purchase system?

2. How many of these vacancies will occur from natural causes, and how many will it be necessary to provide artificially?

Actuaries' Report. (No. 77.)

1. The establishment we have taken as:—

Rank	Cavalry of Line.	Infantry of Line and West India Regiments.
Lieutenant-colonel - -	28	217
Majors - - -	34	296
Captains - - -	222	1,492
Subalterns - - -	405	2,645
	689	4,650

These numbers include supernumeraries.

The infantry lieutenant-colonels comprise 67 officers commanding sub-districts; whom we have treated as holding those commands for five years after they shall have served five years in command of battalions.

2. The average periods for promotion shown in our former report (No. 73, Appendix C.) were:—

Rank.	Service on attaining Rank.	
	Cavalry of Line.	Infantry of Line.
	years.	years.
Lieutenant-colonel - -	$20\frac{4}{12}$	$23\frac{6}{12}$
Major - - - -	$15\frac{10}{12}$	$18\frac{11}{12}$
Captain - - - - -	$7\frac{5}{12}$	9

3. Certain assumptions have been necessary for the calculation. We have assumed,

a. That the command of an infantry battalion or a cavalry regiment will continue to be vacated after five years' service in such command.

b. That sub-lieutenants will enter the army at $18\frac{1}{2}$ years of age on the average; but that their service as lieutenant, and therefore their service for promotion, will only count from the age of 20, the previous $1\frac{1}{2}$ years being probationary. That the number of such probationers will be included in the subalterns shown in § 1.

c. That the Indian Staff Corps will continue to be supplied from the subalterns of the Imperial Army; that its strength will be 2,600 of *all* ages; and that officers will enter it at the average age of 24.

d. That officers will die at the rates shown by the experience of artillery and engineer officers during the present century; and that the after-lifetime of retired officers will be according to the Government life table.

4. The number of vacancies necessary to secure the promotion shown in § 2, would be as shown in the following table:—

Cavalry of the Line.

	Numbers (including supernumeraries) on full pay.	Period of Service in each Rank.	Average Age on attaining the Rank.	Deaths, yearly.	Number annually joining Indian Staff Corps.	Number completing the period for promotion yearly.	Promotions available for those completing the period.	**Yearly number for whom no further regimental service is available.**	Total Number of Officers removed from Regimental Service in the several Ranks.			Number of Non-effective Officers from each Rank for every 100 Officers serving in such Rank.
									Under age of 60.	Over age of 60.	Total.	
Lieutenant-colonels -	28	5	$40\frac{4}{12}$	$\frac{4}{10}$	—	5	Nil.	**3**	70	58	128	457
Majors - - - -	34	$4\frac{6}{12}$	$35\frac{10}{12}$	$\frac{4}{10}$	—	8	6	**2**	31	18	49	144
Captains - - -	222	$8\frac{5}{12}$	$27\frac{5}{12}$	3	—	25	8	**17**	341	159	500	225
Subalterns (including Adjutants).	405	$7\frac{5}{12}$*	20	4	—	43	28	**15**	396	129	525	130
Total - -	689	$25\frac{4}{12}$	—	$7\frac{8}{10}$	—	—	—	**39**	838	364	1,202	174

Entry of Cadets=47.

* Exclusive of $1\frac{1}{2}$ years (from age $18\frac{1}{2}$ to 20) assumed as sub-lieutenants' probationary service, not counting for retirement.

APP. G.

Infantry of Line and West India Regiments.

—	Numbers (including supernumeraries) on full pay.	Period of Service in each Rank.	Average Age on attaining the Rank.	Deaths, yearly.	Number annually joining Indian Staff Corps.	Number completing the period for promotion yearly.	Promotions available for those completing the period.	**Yearly number for whom no further regimental service is available.**	Total Number of Officers removed from Regimental Service in the several Ranks.			Number of Non-effective Officers from each Rank for every 100 Officers serving in such Rank
									Under age of 60.	Over age of 50.	Total.	
Lieutenant-colonels, with depôt brigades -	67											
Lieutenant-colonels, with regiments - -	150	5*	$43\frac{6}{12}$	2‡	—	29*	Nil.*	**29***	234	329	563	259
Majors - - -	296	$4\frac{7}{12}$	$38\frac{11}{12}$	4	—	64	31	**33**	467	340	807	273
Captains - - -	1,492	$9\frac{11}{12}$	29	17	—	141	68	**73**	1,318	723	2,041	137
Subalterns (including Adjutants).	2,645	9†	20†	27	95	188	159	**29**	745	256	1,001	378
Total - -	4,650	$28\frac{6}{12}$	—	50	95	—	—	**164**	2,764	1,648	4,412	93

Entry of Cadets at age $18\frac{6}{12}$ = 310.

* Subject to 14 yearly being appointed for 5 years more to brigade depôts.
† Exclusive of $1\frac{1}{2}$ years (from age $18\frac{1}{2}$ to 20) assumed as sub-lieutenants' probationary service, not counting for retirement.
‡ Besides 1 death among officers commanding brigade depôts.

5. From § 4 it appears that to maintain the flow of promotion which existed under the purchase system there must annually occur:—

Cavalry.

47 removals from the rank of subaltern, of which 28 will be by promotion and four by death.

28 removals from the rank of captain, of which eight will be by promotion and three by death.

8 removals from the rank of major, of which six will be by promotion and ·4 by death.

6 removals from the rank of lieut.-colonel, of which ·4 will be by death and 5 by expiration of the term of five years' service.

Infantry.

310 removals from the rank of subaltern, of which 159 will be by promotion, 27 by death, and 95 by appointment to the Indian staff corps.

159 removals from the rank of captain; of which 68 will be by promotion and 17 by death.

68 removals from the rank of major, of which 31 will be by promotion and four by death.

31 removals from the rank of lieutenant-colonel, of which two will be by death and 29 by expiration of the term of five years' service.

6. It results that the balances represent the officers of the several ranks for whom, every year, there will be no further promotion or regimental employment; and who must accordingly be annually added to the non-effective list, viz.:

—	Cavalry of Line.	Infantry of Line.
Lieutenant-colonels - - -	5	29*
Majors - - - -	2	33
Captains - - - -	17	73
Subalterns - -	15	29
	39	164

* Subject to employment of 14 with sub-districts.

No allowance has been made in this calculation for casualties other than death; but experience in non-purchase corps has shown that there will be some vacancies resulting from voluntary resignation, a small number from dismissal, and some from ill health. These vacancies (the number of which we have no means of estimating) would be in diminution of the vacancies necessary for promotion as shown above. There are also vacancies to be expected from sub-lieutenants failing to qualify for lieutenancies; but such vacancies would do nothing towards facilitating promotion, though they would increase the entry of cadets beyond the number shown in § 4.

7. There are extra-regimental duties, as staff appointments, auxiliary force adjutancies, &c., &c., on which the officers included in § 6 may to some extent be employed.

8. In calculating vacancies it is to be understood that these are the minimum numbers which will provide a flow of promotion at the periods in § 2. These exits (or retirements) might, however, under a system of earlier voluntary retirement, be increased up to a certain limit without diminishing the periods of service for promotion. The limit would be that sufficient should serve the full period to provide the annual number required for promotion to the next rank.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
ROBERT DAVEY.

12th January 1875.

APPENDIX H.

Promotion on the Assumption that Retirement takes place in the Rank of Lieutenant-Colonel only.

Question for the War Office Actuaries.

(Infantry only.)

If every officer were to become a lieutenant-colonel after a total service of 23½ years, the length of service after which, according to your calculation, No. 73 [App. C.], an officer obtained the rank under Purchase; and if the vacancies required to give this rate of promotion were produced among the lieutenant-colonels only—

(1.) How long on an average would an officer hold his appointment as lieutenant-colonel before being called upon to retire to make room for some one else? And—

(2.) What would be the maximum number of lieutenant-colonels on the retired list?

Assume that officers below the rank of lieutenant-colonel retire from the army at the rate which has hitherto prevailed in the artillery, and allow for deaths at such rates as you may consider right.

Actuaries' Report. (No. 108.)

Given the following establishment for infantry officers, as taken in our other calculations,—

Lieutenant-colonels (regimental)	150
Majors	296
Captains	1,492
Subalterns	2,645
	4,583

Allowing for the supply of officers required by the Indian Staff Corps, viz., 95 annually, with the other conditions as fixed by the Royal Commission, 139 would be annually promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and 137 would retire from that rank every year after a service in it of $1\frac{1}{12}$ years.

The maximum number of the officers who had thus quitted regimental lieutenant-colonelcies would be 4,006; of these 227 might be expected to be general officers, 76 with brigade depots or on staff employment, leaving 3,703, for whom half-pay or other provision would be necessary.

Denham Robinson.

9th August 1875.

APPENDIX I.

Returns showing the Number of Retirements of Officers from the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers upon Full and Half Pay, Special Annuities, Resignation of Commission, &c., from 1855 to 1875 inclusive.

Table 1.—Royal Artillery.

Year.	General Officers.	Colonels.		Lieutenant Colonels.		Captains and Majors.					Second Captains now Captains.				Lieutenants.					Total all Ranks per Year.
	Full-pay.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resignations.	Cashiered.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resignations.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resignations.	Removed from the Regiment.	
1855–6	—	5	—	2	1	—	2	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	15
1856–7	—	2	—	—	2	—	3	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	12
1857–8	1	3	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	12
1858–9	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
1859–60	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	4	—	9
1860–1	—	3	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	3	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	13
1861–2	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	5	2	13
1862–3	—	5	—	1	2	—	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	16
1863–4	—	3	—	—	1	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	4	—	13
1864–5	2	2	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	9	—	21
1865–6	—	3	—	—	2	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6	—	16
1866–7	—	1	—	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	6	—	14
1867–8	1	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	8	3	24
1868–9	1	8	—	—	1	—	2	—	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	4	3	24
1869–70	—	3	—	1	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	4	—	2	—	1	—	10	2	27
1870–1	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	—	8	5	21
1871–2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	13	—	—	—	—	11	—	—	3	13	7	—	49
1872–3	—	1	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	4	3	15
1873–4	—	5	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	3	—	16
1874–5	—	4	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	12
Total retirements during 20 years.	5	61	1	7	21	—	34	13	6	1	—	27	11	24	—	10	13	90	19	343

Horse Guards, War Office,
22nd October 1875.

R. Radcliffe,
D.-A.-General.

APP. I.

TABLE 2.—Royal Engineers.

Year.	General Officers.	Colonels.		Lieut.-Colonels.		Captains and Majors.				2nd Captains and Captains.				Lieutenants.						Total.
	Full-pay.	Full-pay.	Half-Pay.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resigned.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resigned.	Full-pay.	Half-pay.	Special Annuities.	Resigned.	Cashiered.	Services dispensed with.	
1855	—	6	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
1856	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	5
1857	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	5
1858	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
1859	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	2
1860	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	4
1861	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	6
1862	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	6
1863	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	5
1864	1	2	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
1865	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	4
1866	—	2	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
1867	—	4	—	1	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	4	—	—	16
1868	—	3	—	1	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	8
1869	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
1870	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	3
1871	—	3	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
1872	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	7
1873	2	4	—	1	—	—	*2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*2	—	1	—	—	12
1874	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
1875	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Total retirements during 20 years.	4	†40	—	†14	4	—	12	—	6	—	8	—	4	—	5	—	20	1	1	119

* In 1873 1 major and 2 lieutenants were placed on a temporary and reduced rate o half-pay.
„ 1875 1 captain do, do.
† Of these numbers one colonel and three lieutenant-colonels were on the seconded list at the time of retiring on full-pay.

Horse Guards, War Office,
26th October 1875.

J. BROWNE,
D.-A.-General R.E.

APPENDIX J.

Letter from the Accountant General of the Army on the Creation of Supernumeraries, &c., in the Royal Artillery in 1872.

No. 20a/664.

Sir, June 19th, 1875.

At the time of the preparation of the recent warrants, reconstituting the rank of major in the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, and providing a new scheme of retirement in order to secure promotion from the rank of captain to field officer, and from major to lieutenant-colonel, after average periods of service, it was fully recognised that the arrangements then made would only for a time obtain the desired flow of promotion in those regiments, the sanction of the Lords of the Treasury, was, therefore, sought for allowing officers holding certain appointments to be made supernumerary in their corps whenever the seniors in the ranks below them exceeded certain periods of service.

The circumstances of the case were laid before their Lordships in a letter dated 23rd May 1872, a copy of which is attached.

In accordance with the proposal there submitted, several officers have from time to time been made supernumerary in the ranks of colonel and lieutenant-colonel in those corps, and for a time this was found to afford much assistance in maintaining the flow of promotion; it has, however, failed to give satisfaction in the regiments, mainly, however, in consequence of its unequal effect upon the various lists for purposes of promotion now existing in the corps.

The conditions under which the action of the rule was to take effect, led officers to regard such promotions as attaching to length of service only, and with some show of reason to complain that some of them were denied promotion athough they had completed the required service, whereas their colleagues in the same corps, but in another cadre, who had completed the same service, obtained promotion by reason of an officer being made supernumerary for the mere purpose of giving that promotion.

By the difficulty thus created the Secretary of State has found himself compelled, in equity, to allow special promotion for mere service to be granted to several Officers on the Indian cadres of the Royal Artillery, and also to certain Officers of the Royal Engineers on the supernumerary list, on the understanding, however, that all further promotions contingent merely on completing a period of service should be suspended.

This decision was given in January last, and Mr. Hardy intimated, when he sanctioned this course, that he would draw the attention of the Commission appointed by Her Majesty to examine the subject of promotion and retirement in the Army, to the whole circumstances of the case, and I am directed by him to request that you will have the goodness to lay his communication before them.

I have, &c.,

John Milton,

Accountant General.

The Secretary to the Royal Commission
on Promotion and Retirement.

(Enclosure.)

39265 22.

Sir, War Office, May 23rd, 1872.

Adverting to the letter from this office of the 14th February 1871, 39265/16, and to the Treasury reply dated the 14th of the following month, No. 2,689 I am now directed by Mr. Secretary Cardwell to request that you will submit for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, the following observations.

The very important position assigned in modern warfare to the scientific corps, renders it a necessity that they should be maintained in a condition of the utmost efficiency. For efficiency it is indispensable that their officers should pass with sufficient rapidity from grade to grade to allow at least of the battery commands being filled by men of only moderate age; future efficiency also demands that the attraction of the service shall suffice to draw to it many of the best among the candidates for a military career. In past years this result has been attained by the open competition for Commissions obtainable without purchase. All arms of the service being now thrown open to similar competition, Mr. Cardwell has reason to apprehend a serious falling off in the number of candidates of conspicuous talent, who will offer themselves for the Artillery and Engineers, unless he can secure to those corps equal promotion with the line.

The retirement hitherto provided has failed to afford the necessary promotion. As some guide to future results, Mr. Cardwell would draw their Lordships' attention to past experience. In 1850, with the proportion between the several ranks differing in no essential point from that now obtaining, and after a long period of peace, the service of the senior captains commanding batteries had attained 36 years, which, with the present age of admission to the corps, would represent men at least 56 years old. The great augmentations, both of the Artillery and Engineers, which followed each other at short intervals from that date to the close of the Indian Mutiny, afforded rapid promotion to the junior officers, and produced efficiency as regards age in the several ranks. Those augmentations have (except as regards a special increment to the Engineers, of which notice will be taken hereafter), ceased for several years, and the corps being, so far as officers are concerned, on a war footing, such relief in the way of promotion cannot be again looked for.

Purchase in the line having been abolished, it is necessary to maintain a flow of promotion for the line, which shall not be seriously below that which was obtained on the average by officers under the purchase system.

The lieutenant-colonels now commanding infantry regiments obtained their promotion to that rank on an average after a total service of 22 years, and the majors after a total service of 17 years and eight months. If these periods be qualified by including in the average the senior officers of the next grades respectively who, as being those passed over under the purchase system, will be the first to profit by its abolition, the average becomes $22\frac{3}{4}$ years and $18\frac{1}{2}$ years respectively for attaining the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major of infantry. Mr. Cardwell does not anticipate that it will be practicable during peace absolutely to maintain those periods, but he is decidedly of opinion that some such periods of service must be preserved as were known as the "standard periods" in the examination of this subject made by the actuaries under the direction of Sir J. Pakington consequent upon the report of the committee of the House of Commons in 1867. These are—

18 years on becoming first captain.
25 years on becoming lieutenant-colonel.

Both for the sake of efficiency in their own regiments and for comparison of advantage with the line, Mr. Cardwell considers it a necessity that the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers should be able to look forward to promotion to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel at a period of service not materially later than that obtaining in the Infantry. This point forms the basis of the system which I am to submit for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners. The limited necessity for Officers of the ranks of Lieutenant-Colonel and Colonel in the duties of the respective scientific corps renders it impossible to maintain those ranks for purely regimental duty in sufficient strength to furnish the requisite promotion to the ranks below. As already stated, their circumstances make it undesirable that a large unattached list of Field Officers should be kept up; it becomes, therefore, necessary to devise some means of maintaining a sufficient flow of promotion to Officers from or above the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

Irrespective of the question of retirement, Mr. Cardwell is desirous of utilising to the utmost extent the services of the Lieutenant-Colonels and regimental Colonels. For this purpose, as partly intimated in the letter from this office of 14th February 1871, he has appointed Lieutenant-Colonels of Artillery to superintend the organisation of the reserve forces of that arm, and he proposes to extend this principle. The Officers so employed, and all Officers of the rank of Colonel or Lieutenant-Colonel employed on the general staff of the Army, or as Superintendents of Manufacturing Departments, or Commandant of the School of Gunnery shall, it is proposed, be made supernumerary at the discretion of the Secretary of State, when ever promotion to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel fails to be brought down to 25 years.

These supernumerary Officers will virtually constitute an addition to the higher ranks of the corps, and will give promotion throughout the ranks, though they will not

APP. J.

require to be replaced in all cases by the addition of subalterns.

As regards the Engineers, the opportunities for their employment with the reserve forces are less, and the relief to be thus obtained proportionately smaller; but the gradual formation of two additional battalions of Officers for Indian service will afford a degree of promotion which will prevent any great stagnation during the next few years.

Mr. Cardwell proposes, however, that the Secretary of State be empowered to make supernumerary to the battalion system all Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels employed on the staff of the Army, on the Ordnance Survey, or as Commandant of the School of Military Engineering, whenever there are Majors in the Corps of more than 25 years' service.

Having thus shown the modification which Mr. Cardwell proposes in the ranks of Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel in the two corps, I am next to advert to the system of retirement under the advice of the Royal Commission on Promotion which sat in 1854. The fixed sums of 32,000*l.* a year for the Artillery and 16,000*l.* for the Engineers were set aside for the retirement of Officers; and Officers of 30 years' service who had attained the rank of regimental Colonel were allowed to retire on 600*l.* a year. By subsequent additions the limits for retirement have been raised to 42,4000*l.* for the Artillery and 18,285*l.* for the Engineers. The actuaries have shown that as the corps approach a normal state these sums will not nearly suffice to provide an adequate flow of promotion, but as the necessity for any large increase does not yet appear to have arisen, Mr. Cardwell only desires at present to raise the limit for the Engineers to 21,500*l.*, to place them on an equal footing, with reference to the number of Officers in the corps respectively, with the Artillery. It is not, however, anticipated that that this addition (for which provision has already been made in the Army estimates), will cause other than a contingent increase of expense, inasmuch as for several years past there has been among the senior Officers of the Royal Engineers such an indisposition to retire that the 18,285*l.* has rarely, if ever, been fully appropriated.

There is, however, one point in which, for both corps, Mr. Cardwell is desirous of altering the system of retirement. Under the present arrangement, the conditions of obtaining 600*l.* a year are the possession of the rank of Colonel, and 30 years' service.

In practice it is found that the officers who retire do so, in most cases, shortly after complying with these conditions, leaving in the ranks of the corps a number of officers senior to themselves, whose removal is only effected by their promotion to the rank of General officer. It is not desirable that officers should thus remain in the corps after completing 40 years' service, and, on the other hand, it is unduly expensive for the public that comparatively young officers of only 30 years' service should retire on large annuities at a time when their physical energies are still equal to much regimental duty, In order, therefore, to remove the temptation for retirement to a point higher up among the Colonels, it is proposed that the privilege of going upon 600*l.* a year should be restricted to officers of 40 years' service and upwards, while Colonels who retire after 30, but after less than 40 years' service, should only do so on a retired full pay of their rank, viz., 1*l.* 6*s.* a day, or 474*l.* 10*s.* a year.

This reduction in the amount of pension in one case, or the tenure of pension in the other case, will enable a larger number of promotions to be caused by the same total expenditure for retirement; but Mr. Cardwell does not not anticipate any retirements after 40 years' service for a considerable number of years, and proposes that when they do happen the amounts so granted shall be over and above the fixed amounts of 42,400*l.* and 21,500*l.* respectively. While, however, this change may fairly apply to future officers of the corps, and also to those officers now so far from the top, that the changes in the ranks already proposed or about to be suggested in the latter part of this letter shall substantially benefit them, there are other officers, more especially the present Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels, whose interests would be materially interfered with, as they have for many years had the full prospect of retiring under existing conditions, and gain little or nothing by the contemplated changes. Mr. Cardwell is unwilling to subject them to any loss by a sudden change of system; he proposes, therefore, for their Lordships' sanction, that he be empowered to award to each officer who shall retire a pension of 600*l.*, less such an annual sum as shall be shown by actuarial calculations to be a fair equivalent for the pecuniary advantages actually accruing, under the measures now proposed, to the officer who shall retire. The retiring annuities would thus be gradually reduced from the present maximum sum of 600*l.* a year to the proposed retired pay of 474*l.* 10*s.*

In the Royal Engineers, where the total sum granted for retirements is rarely full, this concession to vested interests will not cause, it is expected, any excess over the sum at present spent; but in the Royal Artillery, where retirements are accepted with tolerable readiness, and where the full measure of promotion is required which the reduced annuity would afford, Mr. Cardwell desires in each case to make the sum granted, in addition to the 474*l.* 10*s.*, supplemental to the fixed sum of 42,400*l.*

Mr. Cardwell would not seek to conceal from himself that these measures may, and probably will, be ultimately insufficient to secure proper promotion; but he considers that it would not be prudent to incur greater engagements as to prospective retirement than immediate circumstances render necessary, since either a war might possibly render the whole provision unnecessary, or greater means than are now anticipated may offer of employing in the auxiliary forces officers of the higher ranks, or a greater readiness may be exhibited to accept retirement. In the event, however, of peace continuing, and if none of these considerations prove to become practical and to cause promotion, it will be necessary, on arriving at a normal peace establishment, to provide for compulsory retirement in the higher ranks. This, in Mr. Cardwell's opinion, would be the most economical mode as regards the public, and at the same time the most desirable as regards the services.

It is not, however, expedient to provide it in anticipation of a necessity which possibly may never arise.

Having thus shown the steps which Mr. Cardwell proposes, as regards the higher ranks of the Artillery and Engineers, I am next to explain the measures which he considers necessary for securing due efficiency in the ranks below Lieutenant-Colonel.

At present the regimental rank of Major does not exist in either corps. In the Artillery, a battery is commanded by a Captain, who has under his orders a second Captain, and three Subalterns. Having in view, the number of men commanded, the value of the material in his charge, the independent action of a battery in actual warfare, and the great importance generally of the duty, it is considered that the Officer commanding a battery of Artillery, should hold the regimental rank of Major. Mr. Cardwell, therefore, proposes to convert the first Captains into substantive Majors, a rank which they will then hold for about the same period of service as it is held by Majors of Infantry. These Majors are in effect to have 19*s.* 6*d.* a day if commanding Horse Artillery batteries; and the pay of Infantry Majors if commanding batteries of Foot Artillery; but in order to avoid certain complications, when these officers may serve in India it is intended to give them pay at 18*s.* (being the pay of a captain and brigade major) and 14*s.* 6*d.* respectively, making up the difference to 19*s.* 6*d.*, and 16*s.* by the addition of 1*s.* 6*d.* a day as command pay while actually in command of batteries.

The creation in the corps of the rank of major will render it necessary to revise the pay of the junior lieutenant-colonels. Many years ago, one field officer per brigade, (then styled a battalion) held the rank and pay of major, the rank was raised to lieutenant-colonel, but the pay remained unaltered. Mr. Cardwell now desires to equalize the pay of these junior lieutenant-colonels with that of the senior officers in the same rank.

For the Royal Engineers it is proposed similarly to raise the pay of the junior lieutenant-colonels, and to create the rank of major with pay at 15*s.*, and extra pay at 7*s.* 6*d.* a day, the same grounds for creating Majors in the Engineers which held in the Artillery, do not of course obtain; but it is deemed essential to maintain a fair equality between the two corps, which draw their officers from the same class of candidates at the Royal Military Academy.

While issuing warrants for the new rank in these corps of Major, it is proposed to take the opportunity of simplifying the rates of pay by substituting 18*s.* for 17*s.* 11*d.* as the pay of Lieutenant-Colonels in either corps, and 16*s.* in lieu of 15*s.* 11*d.* for Captains of Horse Artillery.

With regard to the ranks below the first captains (proposed Majors) Mr. Cardwell does not, in the Royal Artillery, contemplate any change, the numbers in the rank of Major acting, together with vacancies in the late Indian Artillery cadres, furnishing, for the present, sufficient promotion to the subalterns.

In the Royal Engineers, however, the same course will

not suffice, the subalterns are already of unduly long service, and although, some relief will be afforded by the gradual completion of the 16th and 17th battalions for service in India, by other Indian vacancies, Mr. Cardwell is of opinion that sufficient promotion will not ensue unless the present constitution of a battalion; viz., 1 Colonel Commandant, 2 Colonels, 5 Lieutenant-Colonels, 8 Captains, 8 2nd Captains, 24 lieutenants, be changed into 1 Colonel Commandant, 2 Colonels, 5 Lieutenant-Colonels, 8 Majors, 10 Captains, 22 Lieutenants; this will have the effect in the British eight battalions of substituting 16 Captains for as many Subalterns, and will, with Indian vacancies, afford for a few years the necessary advancement for junior officers.

Irrespective of these proposals to improve the flow of promotion in the ordnance corps, Mr. Cardwell has had under his consideration represensations to the effect that since the large increase in the forces of Horse and Field Artillery, the reduced number of garrison batteries, with the decreased number of officers adopted in 1870, do not admit of the withdrawal of officers for employment upon the staff.

To add to the proportion of Subalterns in the corps would greatly enhance the difficulties of promotion in future, and Mr. Cardwell therefore proposes to make all battery officers who may be employed extra-regimentally supernumerary to the establishment of their respective ranks.

I have now specified the various measures which Mr. Cardwell directs me to urge upon their Lordships as essential for the proper efficiency of two of the most important branches of the army.

The proposal may be thus summarized:—

For the Royal Artillery.

Effective List.

Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels holding certain appointments to be made supernumerary whenever the senior Major shall exceed 25 years' service, and all other officers to be made supernumerary when removed from duty with their batteries.

All Lieutenant-Colonels (other than of Horse Artillery) to have 18*s.* a day.

The substantive rank and pay of Major to be given to commandants of batteries.

Second Captains to be styled Captains without increase of pay.

Non-effective List.

Retirements on 600*l.* a year to be limited to officers of 40 years' service, and to be supplemental to the establishment of 42,400*l.* a year.

Officers retiring as colonels with less than 40 years' service to retire on the full pay of the rank, viz., 474*l.* 10*s.* a year, subject to an addition (supplemental to the 42,400*l.*) to meet the vested interests of existing officers.

For the Royal Engineers.

Effective List.

Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels as in the Artillery.

The rank and pay of Major to be given to first Captains.

Second Captains to be styled Captains without increase of pay, and to be increased to 10 per battalions.

Lieutenants to be decreased by two per battalion.

Non-effective List.

The nominal limit for the retirement of officers of 30 years' service, and less than 40 years' service, to be raised from 18,285*l.* a year to 21,500*l.*

Retirements on 600*l.* a year to be limited to officers of 40 years' service, and to be supplemental to the establishment of 21,500*l.* a year.

Officers retiring as Colonels with less than 40 years' service to retire on 474*s.* 10*s.* a year, subject to an addition (included in the 21,500*l.*) to meet the vested interests of existing officers.

The estimated cost for the whole of the present year is shown in the accompanying statement, but the expense for only a portion of the year will be incurred, and will not cause an excess upon the votes of Parliament.

——	Artillery. £	s.	d.	Engineers. £	s.	d.
For additional supernumerary officers	-	-	-	894	0	0
Increased pay of junior Lieutenant-Colonels, and for alteration in the pay of other Lieutenant-Colonels	575	0	0	554	0	0
For substituting Majors for first Captains	11,084	0	0	7,100	0	0
Forage for do.	2,000	0	0	1,500	0	0
For altering the pay of Captains of Horse Artillery	42	0	0	—		
For increasing the proportion of Captains in the Engineers	-	-	-	949	0	0
For non-effective charges	283	0	0	—		
Total	13,984	0	0	10,997	0	0
Grand total	24,981	0	0			

The accompanying draft warrants are submitted for their Lordships' consideration.

They include those points for which Her Majesty's warrant is requisite, and I am to state that Mr. Cardwell considers that these warrants, with the other measures proposed, will, for the present, bring the promotion to about the "standard" periods which are considered necessary for efficiency, although, on the whole, the promotion afforded will be behind the average of the Infantry of the Line.

I am, &c.

(Signed) H. Campbell.

The Secretary to the Treasury.

APPENDIX K.

Memoranda on the various Alterations of Establishment and other special Circumstances which have tended to quicken the Promotion of Officers of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers since the Crimean War.

Part I.—Royal Artillery.

Horse Guards, W. O.,
13th August 1875.

In compliance with the request contained in the Minute of the 7th instant, the Deputy Adjutant-General has the honor to forward herewith, for the information of the Royal Commission upon Army Promotion and Retirement, a statement containing in a statistical form a history of the promotion of the old list of the Royal Artillery for the last 20 years.

Beginning with the close of the Crimean War in 1855, which left the regiment with an establishment of 725 combatant officers, the changes in each year are entered into in detail, together with the several measures which have operated upon the promotion of the regiment at various dates, up to the present time.

It will be observed that in 1855, whilst the colonels commandant, regimental colonels, and the senior lieutenant-colonels were very old, the junior lieutenant-colonels, captains, and second captains obtained these steps at comparatively early periods of service, which is to be explained by the successive augmentations during the Crimean war, and the casualties which occurred in these latter ranks during that campaign.

Owing to subsequent additions to the establishment in 1858, 1859, 1860, and 1864, this favorable rate of promotion for the lower grades continued, the higher ranks remaining unaffected, so far as age and service were concerned.

In 1867–8 an addition was made to the retired full-pay vote of the Royal Artillery to the extent of 10,400*l.*, which gave retirements to 17 regimental colonels at 600*l.* per annum each; the whole of these were taken up, unfortunately not by the older officers, but by the very junior amongst the colonels, men comparatively young and full of energy and activity.

These retirements, whilst giving a temporary impetus to promotion, did not have much effect upon the lower ranks, *i.e.* the lieutenant-colonels, captains, second captains, and lieutenants, as they were steadily increasing in age and service on promotion to the various steps, as compared with the period between 1855 and 1864.

This is accounted for by the officers of the artillery joining the regiment in half-yearly batches, which necessarily bring large numbers of officers upon the list for promotion of the same age and service, although between the first and last of each batch there is, in some cases, a number sufficiently large to make a difference of from one to three years in their respective dates of promotion.

The difficulty of dealing with such large batches of officers in the way of promotion was fully felt by Lord Cardwell, when Secretary of State, and to in some degree lighten the task of providing promotion at a reasonable amount of service for the regiment, His Lordship in 1870, reduced the third subaltern in each garrison battery on the imperial establishment, thus decreasing the number of lieutenants by 84.

In 1871 it became necessary to take some further step, as the junior grades by this time were fast approaching a very unhealthy state, the senior subalterns having over 12 years service, as compared with six and seven years of but 10 years before.

After several committees had sat to consider the question, it was decided to grant special annuities to a certain number of captains, second captains, and lieutenants, with the view of thinning out the lower ranks; this was partially successful as we retired 37 officers under the operation, but the evil was too great to be much affected by this arrangement, and it was patent that further steps must be taken if promotion was to be kept in anything approaching a healthy state, and with this view 12 lieutenant-colonels who were appointed inspectors of auxiliary artillery were made supernumerary, and their places on the effective list filled up by making promotion in their room.

In July 1872, a new Warrant granting the rank of regimental major to all captains, and revising the rules which govern the future retirement of the regiment, was issued, the old regulations being altered so far as to allow of unlimited retirement upon 600*l.* per annum to major-generals and regimental colonels of 40 years' service and upwards, leaving the full amount of the retired full pay vote (42,400*l.*) to cover retirement of officers of 30 years' service and upwards, at amounts varying from 365*l.* up to 600*l.* per annum.

The advantages which this Warrant gave, or was supposed to give, were indirectly supplemented by placing upon the supernumerary list all officers holding army staff appointments, filling the adjutancies of the auxiliary artillery by captains from the Royal Artillery, who were made supernumerary, and providing promotion for majors of 25 years' service to lieutenant-colonel, in vacancies created by placing colonels and lieutenant-colonels, employed in any position, on the supernumerary list.

This system of promotion, after being in existence barely a year, was stopped by the Secretary of State, pending the report of the present Royal Commission, a system which may here be remarked has only benefitted the particular individuals promoted under it, by their obtaining their promotion somewhat earlier than they otherwise would, the regiment having given back the steps gained by absorptions in subsequent vacancies.

A glance at the ages and service of the senior and junior in each grade in the present year, as compared with similar data in 1855, will show that the means devised and carried out for the purpose of stimulating promotion, has only had the effect of improving the condition of the two higher grades, leaving those from Lieut.-Colonel downwards in a worse position than at any portion of the period under review.

		1855.		1875.	
		Age.	Service.	Age.	Service.
		Yrs. mos.	Yrs. mos.	Yrs. mos.	Yrs. mos.
Colonel Commdt.	senior	83 11	63 0	87 4	71 8
	junior	73 11	58 1	64 8	47 2
Colonel	senior	67 6	52 4	59 1	40 8
	junior	56 6	34 9	50 2	31 8
Lieut.-Colonel	senior	56 9	34 2	49 2	31 8
	junior	39 2	20 4	43 2	25 1
Major	senior	38 0	20 0	42 9	25 1
	junior	29 0	10 10	37 8	19 3
Captain	senior	29 9	10 10	37 5	19 2
	junior	23 4	5 10	34 7	13 0

It will be seen from the statement which accompanies this paper that no less than 165 steps have been given to the regiment by these extraordinary measures, being rather more than eight steps per annum in addition to the ordinary casualties by retirement, resignation, death, &c., without the result which it was anticipated it would afford, leaving it necessary that some further means of retirement should be provided of a nature sufficiently elastic to regulate the promotion of a large regiment like the artillery, the establishment of which can never be looked upon as fixed at a normal rate.

R. Radcliffe,
D. A. G., R.A.

STATEMENT showing the Variation in the EFFECTIVE ESTABLISHMENT of OFFICERS upon the Old List, since the close of the Crimean War (say 1st October 1855) up to the 1st April 1875, together with such Measures as have from time to time been taken to keep up the flow of Promotion in the Regiment which has existed during that period; also the effect upon Promotion in the number of Steps gained, and the Ages and Service at what may be termed such Exceptional Measures by the Senior and Junior in each Grade.

Year.	Date	Cause.	Number.						Exceptional Measures taken for Promotion.	Number of Steps gained.					—	Senior.		Junior.	
			Colonel Commandant.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Captains.	Second Captains.	Lieutenants.		Colonels to General Officers.	Lieut.-Colonels to Colonels.	Captains to Lieut.-Colonels.	Second Captains to Captains.	Lieutenants to Second Captains.		Age. Years.	Service. Years.	Age. Years.	Service. Years.
Effective Establishment, 1st Oct. 1855			15	30	60	120	137	363											
1856	March	Half a troop of Horse Artillery	—	—	—	—	1	2		—	—	—	—	1	Col. Commandant	$83\frac{2}{12}$	63	$73\frac{11}{12}$	$58\frac{1}{12}$
															Colonel	$67\frac{6}{12}$	$52\frac{4}{12}$	$56\frac{6}{12}$	$34\frac{9}{12}$
															Lieut.-Colonel	$56\frac{9}{12}$	$34\frac{2}{12}$	$39\frac{4}{12}$	$20\frac{4}{12}$
															Captain	38	20	29	$10\frac{10}{12}$
															Second Captain	$29\frac{9}{12}$	$10\frac{10}{12}$	$23\frac{4}{12}$	$5\frac{10}{12}$
1857	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1858	January	Two troops of Horse Artillery	—	—	—	2	2	6		—	—	—	2	4	Col. Commandant	$85\frac{2}{12}$	65	$75\frac{4}{12}$	$58\frac{6}{12}$
															Colonel	$70\frac{8}{12}$	$52\frac{11}{12}$	$46\frac{10}{12}$	$29\frac{10}{12}$
															Lieut.-Colonel	$47\frac{5}{12}$	$29\frac{10}{12}$	$38\frac{10}{12}$	$21\frac{4}{12}$
															Captain	$40\frac{2}{12}$	$20\frac{11}{12}$	$30\frac{8}{12}$	$11\frac{8}{12}$
															Second Captain	$30\frac{8}{12}$	$11\frac{8}{12}$	$24\frac{10}{12}$	$6\frac{10}{12}$
1859	August	Depôt Brigade	—	—	—	3	9	8		—	—	1	6	17	Col. Commandant	$83\frac{3}{12}$	$65\frac{1}{12}$	$74\frac{8}{12}$	$56\frac{7}{12}$
	December	Two batteries for China	—	—	1	2	2	6							Colonel	$68\frac{7}{12}$	$50\frac{6}{12}$	47	30
															Lieut.-Colonel	$47\frac{11}{12}$	30	$38\frac{8}{12}$	$20\frac{8}{12}$
															Captain	$37\frac{7}{12}$	$20\frac{8}{12}$	$31\frac{12}{12}$	$12\frac{7}{12}$
															Second Captain	$31\frac{2}{12}$	$12\frac{2}{12}$	25	7
1860	April	15 Brigade added	1	2	4	3	9	24		—	—	—	—	—	Col. Commandant	$84\frac{1}{12}$	$66\frac{3}{12}$	75	$56\frac{6}{12}$
	—	Increase to depôts	—	—	—	2	3	14							Colonel	$67\frac{6}{12}$	$50\frac{11}{12}$	$47\frac{4}{12}$	$29\frac{5}{12}$
										1	3	7	17	29	Lieut.-Colonel	49	$29\frac{5}{12}$	$38\frac{2}{12}$	$21\frac{1}{12}$
															Captain	$38\frac{11}{12}$	$21\frac{11}{12}$	$31\frac{8}{12}$	$12\frac{4}{12}$
															Second Captain	30	$12\frac{4}{12}$	$24\frac{6}{12}$	6
1861	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1862	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1863	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1864	April	Head-quarters for B. Brigade, R.H.A.	1	2	2	—	1	—		1	3	5	5	6	Col. Commandant	84	$69\frac{1}{12}$	$74\frac{8}{12}$	$58\frac{11}{12}$
															Colonels	$70\frac{2}{12}$	$51\frac{4}{12}$	$50\frac{9}{12}$	$31\frac{4}{12}$
															Lieut.-Colonels	$48\frac{8}{12}$	$31\frac{7}{12}$	40	$21\frac{3}{12}$
															Captains	$40\frac{1}{12}$	$21\frac{3}{12}$	$32\frac{8}{12}$	$14\frac{4}{12}$
															Second Captains	$31\frac{4}{12}$	$13\frac{11}{12}$	$26\frac{5}{12}$	$8\frac{3}{12}$
1865	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1866	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1867	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,200*l.* added to retired full-pay grant, giving eight additional retirements	—	8	8	8	8	Col. Commandant	$88\frac{1}{12}$	$72\frac{5}{12}$	$76\frac{3}{12}$	$58\frac{4}{12}$
															Colonel	$55\frac{11}{12}$	$36\frac{8}{12}$	$45\frac{2}{12}$	$28\frac{5}{12}$
															Lieut.-Colonel	$45\frac{6}{12}$	$28\frac{4}{12}$	$41\frac{4}{12}$	$22\frac{2}{12}$
															Captain	$40\frac{7}{12}$	$21\frac{8}{12}$	$33\frac{2}{12}$	$14\frac{8}{12}$
															Second Captain	$32\frac{8}{12}$	$14\frac{8}{12}$	$28\frac{7}{12}$	$10\frac{10}{12}$
1868	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A further addition of 5,200*l.* to the R.A.P. vote, giving nine retirements	—	9	9	9	9	Col. Commandant	$89\frac{1}{12}$	$73\frac{5}{12}$	$74\frac{6}{12}$	$55\frac{5}{12}$
															Colonel	$56\frac{3}{12}$	$37\frac{9}{12}$	$46\frac{6}{12}$	$29\frac{5}{12}$
															Lieut.-Colonel	47	$29\frac{5}{12}$	42	$22\frac{6}{12}$
															Captain	41	$22\frac{3}{12}$	35	$15\frac{8}{12}$
															Second Captain	$34\frac{9}{12}$	$15\frac{6}{12}$	$29\frac{2}{12}$	$11\frac{8}{12}$

1869	April -	*No. 8 battery 1st brigade reduced* -	—	—	—	*1*	*1*	*3*	- - - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1870	*April* -	*Depôt R.H.A. reduced.*	—	—	*1*	*1*	*1*	*4*	*The third subaltern in each battery of garrison artillery on the Imperial establishment was reduced in order to lessen the number of lieutenants for whom promotion had to be provided* -	—	—			—	—	—	—	—	—
	— -	*Reduction of one lieutenant in each garrison battery* -	—	—	—	—	—	*84*												
1871	February	Increase to Horse and Field Artillery -	—	—	—	2	4	44	1. Under R. W. of 31st May 1871, 13 captains, 11 second captains, and 13 lieutenants, retired upon special annuities, to clear the blocks in the lower grades - - - - 2. The 10 lieut.-colonels who were this year appointed Inspectors of Artillery were placed upon the supernumerary list in order to give promotion - - - -	—	—	10	25	40	Col. Commandant Colonel - Lieut.-Colonel - Captain - Second Captain -	$83\frac{9}{12}$ $56\frac{10}{12}$ $47\frac{8}{12}$ $42\frac{8}{12}$ $34\frac{8}{12}$	$68\frac{8}{12}$ $38\frac{4}{12}$ $28\frac{1}{12}$ $23\frac{4}{12}$ $16\frac{10}{12}$	$70\frac{5}{12}$ $46\frac{10}{12}$ $42\frac{11}{12}$ $34\frac{11}{12}$ $30\frac{3}{12}$	47 $28\frac{10}{12}$ $23\frac{4}{12}$ $16\frac{10}{12}$ $12\frac{7}{12}$
1872	- - -	—	—	—	—	- -	—	—	1. The two lieut.-colonels appointed Inspectors of Auxiliary Artillery in Ireland made supernumerary - 2. One major and 11 captains holding staff appointments made supernumerary - - - -	—	—	2	3	14	Col. Commandant Colonel - Lieut.-Colonel - Captain - Second Captain -	$84\frac{9}{12}$ $57\frac{7}{12}$ $48\frac{8}{12}$ $43\frac{6}{12}$ $35\frac{11}{12}$	$69\frac{8}{12}$ $38\frac{6}{12}$ $29\frac{1}{12}$ $24\frac{6}{12}$ $17\frac{4}{12}$	$60\frac{11}{12}$ $48\frac{8}{12}$ $43\frac{7}{12}$ $36\frac{9}{12}$ $30\frac{9}{12}$	$44\frac{2}{12}$ $30\frac{6}{12}$ $24\frac{6}{12}$ $17\frac{4}{12}$ $12\frac{6}{12}$
1873	- - -	—	—	—	—	-	—	—	Five majors holding staff appointments made supernumerary - - Eight captains appointed adjutants of auxiliary artillery - - -	—	—	—	5	13	Col. Commandant Colonel - Lieut.-Colonel - Major - Captain -	$85\frac{1}{12}$ $56\frac{3}{12}$ 49 $43\frac{8}{12}$ $34\frac{4}{12}$	$70\frac{1}{12}$ $38\frac{5}{12}$ $30\frac{9}{12}$ $24\frac{10}{12}$ $17\frac{8}{12}$	$62\frac{5}{12}$ 49 $43\frac{8}{12}$ $34\frac{11}{12}$ $31\frac{5}{12}$	$44\frac{10}{12}$ $30\frac{3}{12}$ $24\frac{10}{12}$ $17\frac{8}{12}$ $12\frac{5}{12}$
1874	- -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1. Six majors promoted lieut.-colonels on completing 25 years' service, vacancies being provided by making three employed colonels and three employed lieut.-colonels supernumerary to the establishment - 2. Six captains appointed adjutants to auxiliary artillery - - -	—	3	6	6	12	Col. Commandant Colonel - Lieut.-Colonel - Major - Captain -	$86\frac{4}{12}$ $56\frac{6}{12}$ $49\frac{11}{12}$ $43\frac{1}{12}$ 36	$71\frac{4}{12}$ $38\frac{7}{12}$ $24\frac{7}{12}$ $24\frac{7}{12}$ $17\frac{7}{12}$	$63\frac{8}{12}$ $50\frac{4}{12}$ $35\frac{5}{12}$ $35\frac{5}{12}$ $32\frac{3}{12}$	$46\frac{1}{12}$ $30\frac{1}{12}$ 17 $17\frac{7}{12}$ $13\frac{3}{12}$
1875	April -	Staff for three additional brigade head-quarters -	—	—	6	1	3	3	1. Four majors promoted lieut.-colonels on completing 25 years' service, the vacancies being provided by making supernumerary to the establishment four employed colonels - - *Note.*—The steps thus gained were shortly after (three months) repaid by absorbing into the establishment again the four colonels made supernumerary in ordinary vacancies. 2. Five captains appointed adjutants of auxiliary artillery - - - 3. Of the five lieut.-colonels added to the establishment on 1st April, three were absorbed by bringing back to the effective list the three placed thereon in 1874, to give promotion to the 25 years' majors.	—	—	2	3	11	Col. Commandant Colonel - Lieut.-Colonel - Major - Captain -	$87\frac{4}{12}$ $59\frac{1}{12}$ $49\frac{2}{12}$ $42\frac{9}{12}$ $37\frac{6}{12}$	$71\frac{8}{12}$ $40\frac{8}{12}$ $31\frac{6}{12}$ $25\frac{1}{12}$ $19\frac{2}{12}$	$64\frac{8}{12}$ $50\frac{2}{12}$ $42\frac{2}{12}$ $37\frac{8}{12}$ $34\frac{7}{12}$	$47\frac{2}{12}$ $31\frac{8}{12}$ $25\frac{1}{12}$ $19\frac{3}{12}$ 13
Effective Establishment, 1st April 1875			17	34	71	138	169	379												

Note.—The reductions in the above statement are shown in italics.

Horse Guards,
War Office, 10th August 1875.

R. RADCLIFFE, D. A. G. R.A.

APP.
PART II.

PART II.—Royal Engineers.

For facilities in grading and promotion, &c., the corps of the Royal Engineers is divided into battalions, the strength of each battalion being:—

Col. Comdt.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Majors.	Capts.	Lieuts.	Total.
1	2	5	8	8 formerly / 10 now	24 / 22	48

In July 1856 the establishment of officers of the corps of Royal Engineers stood at 7½ battalions, divided into the following ranks:—

Cols. Comdt.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	1st Capts.	2nd Capts.	Lieuts.	Total.
8	15	37	60	60	180	360

but the strength at that time was only of all ranks - - - - - - - 297

Leaving below establishment - - - - 63

This deficiency was partly the result of casualties during the Crimean War, and partly because the approved augmentation of establishment could not be completed.

To define the position of the corps more clearly, it is necessary to go back to 1854, and give the following particulars:—

	All Ranks.	
Establishment in February 1854 - - - - - -	288	Actual strength - - 282 Wanting - - - 6
„ March 1854 - - - - - - -	336	One Battalion increase.
„ April 1855 - - - - - - -	360	Half Battalion increase.

at which latter number it stood till April 1861.

Now, with an increase of establishment of 72 of all ranks in the short space of 14 months, added to the abnormal casualties during the Crimean War, it is clear that larger numbers of cadets must have been taken than had previously been the practice.

As a proof of this it may be remarked that during the five years immediately preceding the Crimean War only 34 officers were taken into the corps, whereas in the five years immediately after, no less than 150 were taken.

The alterations and actual increase of numbers in the higher ranks during 1854–55, although in strict proportion, on the battalion system, to that hitherto in force, were very disproportioned to the difference of numbers taken as lieutenants, when the same is regarded in an individual light.

This is shewn by the following table:—

	Colonel Commandant.	Colonels.	Lieutenant Colonels.	1st Captains.	2nd Captains.	Lieutenants.	Total.
February 1854 - -	6	12	30	48	48	144	288
April 1855 - -	8	15	37	60	60	180	360
March 1861 - -	8	15	37	60	60	180	360

The prospects of the cadets admitted to the corps during the two given periods therefore stood:—

	Admissions.		Places above rank of Lieutenant.
From 1849–54 - -	34	to	144
„ 1856–60 - -	150	to	180

half the corps being lieutenants.

It is likewise to be remarked that the cadets commissioned, who had gone through Woolwich under the ordinary regulations, *i.e.* two years' course, during the period from 1854 to 1859, were very young men, and that of these, numbers were of nearly equal age, but against this there were some admitted after a short course, *i.e.*, about 6 months, who were much older, thus producing the inequalities of age as shewn in Return C. which has been already rendered.

This would of course in itself tend to make many difficulties in the future.

The numbers that joined between 1849 and 1854 being so limited, it followed that they, and those that joined in 1855, obtained their promotion very rapidly up to the rank of 1st captains (*i.e.*, now major).

From the statement in Table E. (already rendered) of the number of cadets that have joined since 1856 it is quite evident that a most serious block, as shewn in estimate on last page hereof, would have occurred in promotion to the rank of captain long ere this had not relief been found from the following causes:—

1. In 1859 in consequence of urgent requirement of officers of Royal Engineers for works of defence, it was decided that those employed as professors and instructors at the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, and Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, should be made supernumerary.

	In 1859.	In 1875.
Lieut.-Colonels -	2	4
Majors - - -	—	1
Captains - - -	6	8
2nd Captains -	2	—
Total No. of steps	10	13

Promotions as per margin have been the result.

2. In the same year the director and the superintending officer of the Topographical Department, War Office, (Lieut.-Colonel H. James and Captain A. C. Cooke,) and the members of the Ordnance Select Committee (Lieut.-Colonel William Robinson for Royal Engineers) were also made supernumerary.

	In 1859.	In 1875.
Lieut.-Colonels -	2	—
Captains - - -	1	—
Total No. of steps	3	Nil.

This rule, however, is not now in operation.

3. On 1st April 1861 the establishment was increased by 15 officers (1 captain, 2 2nd captains, and 12 lieutenants) making a total of all ranks of 375.

	In 1861.	In 1875.	
Captains - - -	1	1	Major.
2nd Captains - -	2	2	Captains.
Total No. of steps	3	3	

4. On 1st April 1862 the establishment was again increased by 9 officers (1 colonel, 3 lieut.-colonels, 3 captains, and 2 2nd captains), giving a total of all ranks of 384, thus completing the eight battalions which were divided.

	In 1862.	In 1875.	
Colonels - -	1	1	
Lieut.-Colonels -	3	3	
Captains - -	3	3	Majors.
2nd Captains -	2	2	Captains.
Total No. of steps	9	9	

Cols. Comdt.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Capts.	2nd Capts.	Lieuts.	Total.
8	16	40	64	64	192	384

In June 1862 the amalgamation took place between the Imperial and Indian corps.

At that time the Indian Cadres were 28 lieutenants below establishment, to fill which a large number of cadets had again to be taken in a very limited period. See Return marked E. previously rendered.

But to return to the cause of flow of extra promotion.

5. In 1867 the amount of the retired full-pay vote was increased by 2,285*l.*

To this cause about 4 steps to regimental colonel may be assigned, although the money was not all taken up immediately it was available.

6. In 1868 the system of seconding officers of the Indian cadres, who were specially employed, was introduced generally, and was carried out to the extent of

	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Capts.	2 Captns.	Lieuts.	Total.
Original numbers	—	6	15	10	12	43
			Majors.	Captns.		
Present numbers	3	8	11	7	—	29

This did not directly interfere with the Imperial officers, but the actual results were that the lieutenants of the Indian cadres became exhausted so much the earlier, and that from this cause, taken in connexion with paragraph 9, there are at the present moment 29 officers, who joined the Imperial corps before the amalgamation, that have obtained their promotion to captain by Indian casualties before they otherwise would have done.—See Amalgamation Regulations.—Gazette, 28 May 1861.

7. In 1870 it was decided that two additional battalions, 98 officers, should be formed for India service, but that the promotion for one battalion should go to the Imperial corps.

To	
General officers -	2
Colonels - - -	2
Lieut.-Colonels -	5
Majors - - -	8
Captains - - -	10
Total No. of steps -	27

This augmentation, and the promotion consequent thereon, spread over a period of four years, and gave steps as per margin.

8. In 1872 it was decided that certain colonels and lieut.-colonels occupying staff appointments, and special employ positions, and who were paid by consolidated salary, should be made supernumerary when necessary, in order to give promotion to majors of 25 years' service.

This at one time was carried out to the extent of four colonels and three lieut.-colonels, but at present only two colonels are so placed, and the benefits of the promotion originally derived, having been subsequently met by bonâ fide casualties, the advantage is now limited to two colonels, and the table given at the end hereof is calculated accordingly.

	In 1872-73.	In 1875.
Colonels - -	4	2
Lieut.-Colonels -	3	—
Total No. of steps (effectives) -	7	2

The two junior lieut.-colonels being on the instructional staff at Woolwich, and supernumeraries, have certainly been also pushed up by the 25 years' process, but they have not given actual additional promotion, credit having been taken for them as majors under paragraph 1.

9. In 1872 the number of captains to each battalion was increased from 8 to 10, thus giving the 16 additional steps to the lieutenants (Imperials.)

Captains - - -	16

10. In same year the amount of the retired full pay vote was increased from 18,285*l.* to 21,500*l.*, but as only a very small portion of this has at any time been appropriated, it cannot be said that more than one lieut.-colonel's step has actually accrued to the corps therefrom.

The amount added was 3,215*l.*, the amount in hand at this moment unappropriated is 2,785*l.*

As previously remarked, the disinclination of officers at present to retire on full pay is doubtless partly attributable to the taxing process under Lord Cardwell's system, and partly to the deterioration of the value of money since the amount of 600*l.* a year was fixed in 1854 for retirement on full pay.

The following is a summary of the benefits in promotion that have accrued, and are still taking effect in the Corps, from the abnormal causes as detailed :—

Cause.	Year.	Generals.			Colonels.			Lieut.-Colonels.			Majors.			Captains.		
		By Augmentation.	By Succession.	Total.	By Augmentation.	By Succession.	Total.	By Augmentation.	By Succession.	Total.	By Augmentation.	By Succession.	Total.	By Augmentation.	By Succession.	Total.
Supernumeraries Staff College and Academy	1859	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	4	1	4	5	8	5	13
Topographical Department - -	„	—	—	—	—	—	—	Nil.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Augmentation - - - -	1861	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	1	3
Augmentation - - - -	1862	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	1	4	3	4	7	2	7	9
Increase retired full pay - -	1867	—	—	—	—	4	4	—	4	4	—	4	4	—	4	4
By Indian Seconding - -	1868 to 1874	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	29
Augmentation of one battalion -	1870 to 1874	2	—	2	2	2	4	5	4	9	8	9	17	10	17	27
Supernumerary Colonels, 25 years' service	1872	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	2	2	—	2	2	—	2	2
Additional Captains per Battalion - - -	1872	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	—	16
Increase of retired full pay vote - -	1872	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	—	1	1
Total promotions - - -		2	—	2	3	8	11	12	12	24	13	24	37	38	66	104
The result of abnormal causes - -		2			11			24			37			104		

Note.—In 1872 the rank of 1st Captain was converted into that of Major, and 2nd Captain to Captain.

APP. K. PART II

The following table shews approximately what would have been the position of the corps at the present moment if it had not been for these abnormal causes.

It would be very difficult, almost impossible, to shew this exactly, because certain retirements have been the actual results from the causes before detailed, but the following may be taken as giving smoe fair idea of the list as it would have been:—

	Names.	Service.		Present Rank.	Service in Present Rank.	
		Years.	mos.		Years.	mos.
Senior Colonel	J. S. Hawkins	42	9	Major-General	1	5
Junior ditto	H. F. Keane	36	6	Colonel	3	2
Senior Lieutenant-Colonel	F. C. Hassard	35	3	Colonel	3	0
Junior ditto	S. B. Farrell	29	0	Lieutenant-Colonel	3	2
Senior Major	C. W. Barry	28	9	Lieutenant-Colonel	3	2
Junior ditto	E. R. Festing	20	4	Major	3	2
Senior Captain	G. W. Stockley	20	4	Major	3	2
Junior ditto	G. M. Collings	17	8	Captain	6	5
Senior Lieutenant	R. H. Vetch	17	8	Captain	6	1
Junior ditto	G. T. Nicholls	3	1	Lieutenant	3	8

21st August 1875.

J. BROWNE,
D. A. General, R.E.

APP. L.

APPENDIX L.

PROMOTION IN THE ORDNANCE CORPS ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE EXISTING REGULATIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.

QUESTION for the WAR OFFICE ACTUARIES.

What will be the probable state of the Ordnance Corps as regards the length of service of the officers in the several ranks in the year 1885, supposing no change to be made in the existing retirement regulations before that date?

PART I.—Royal Artillery.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 113.)

1. The retirements now open to the British list of the Royal Artillery are three in number,—

(*a.*) Voluntary pensions of 600*l.* a year, available for general officers or colonels after 40 years' service:

(*b.*) Voluntary pensions after 30 years' service of 474*l.* 10*s.* to colonels, or 365*l.* to lieutenant-colonels, up to a maximum of 42,400*l.* a year. A supplementary pension is given to the colonels in consideration of vested interests acquired before 1872. This supplementary pension will gradually diminish until extinguished.

(*c.*) Half-pay after 25 years' service.

2. As regards the pension of 600*l.* after 40 years' service, no instance of its acceptance has yet occurred since the warrant of July 1872. In our calculation we have assumed that every officer entitled to it will take this pension whenever its value to him exceeds the value of his prospective pay on the active list as colonel, general officer unattached, and colonel commandant. It will not, on this assumption, be accepted before 1883; but from that year onwards its acceptance will be of frequent occurrence.

3. Up to this time the pension of 474*l.* 10*s.* (with an addition) has been taken as it has become available, usually by officers who have recently attained the rank of colonel. We have assumed that this will continue to be the case, and that the retired establishment of 42,400*l.* will be always full. As, however, the "added pensions" will have decreased considerably before the expiration of the 10 years ending 1885, the attraction of this pension may diminish; and there may, perhaps, be less promotion attributable to this retirement than we have allowed for. As a set-off against any excess under this head we have excluded all retirement of lieutenant-colonels.

4. With reference to half-pay retirement after 25 years' service it is so very rarely accepted that we have left it out of consideration.

5. In our calculations for the British list of officers we have formed tables of mortality from the experience of Artillery officer's life during the half century ending 1870. The rate of resignation at the several periods of service is similarly based on the experience of the 10 years, 1861–70.

6. The gradual extinction of the three Indian cadres of officers and their replacement by British officers will cause, for many years, certain steps of promotion to fall to the latter. To ascertain the probable number of these steps we have found the average rate of depletion in each Indian rank during the period 1863–1875, being the period during which they have formed a portion of the British army. We have made allowance for the steps thus gained for the British list in the ranks of captain and major during the period under consideration.

7. As part of the arrangement made in 1872, there was an understanding that lieutenant-colonels and colonels holding certain extra-regimental appointments, should be made supernumerary whenever the senior major reached a service of 25 years. This arrangement had operated to a considerable extent, when it was suspended pending the report of the Royal Commission. We have considered that our instructions required us to assume its continued operation. The Deputy Adjutant General, Royal Artillery, has informed us that the following may be regarded as the condition of the supernumerary and seconded list applicable to the present body of officers in the British and Amalgamated lists. It will increase as the amalgamation progresses:—

	Permanently Seconded or Supernumerary.	Now Supernumerary under Warrant.	Further number who may be made Supernumerary.	Total to be Seconded and Supernumerary.
Colonels	—	4	5	9
Lieut.-colonels	7	14		23
Majors	30	—	—	30
Captains	55	—	—	55
Lieutenants	27	—	—	27

8. The numbers with which we have to deal then become—

IN NOVEMBER 1875.

	Effective.	Supernumerary or Seconded.	Total.
General officers -	32	—	32
Colonels - -	33	4	37
Lieut.-colonels -	71	21	92
Majors - -	138	30	168
Captains - -	172	55	227*
Lieutenants - -	552	27	579
Total British and Amalgamated list.	998	137	1,135

* In process of completion from Indian cadres.

These numbers reach (from augmentations under sections 6 and 7) by the year 1885, the following :—

NOVEMBER 1885.

	Effective.	Supernumerary or Seconded.	Total.
General officers - -	32	—	32
Colonels - -	33	9	42
Lieut.-colonels - -	71	23	94
Majors - - -	173	35	208*
Captains - - -	249	88	337
Lieutenants - -	552	27	579
Total - -	1,110	182	1,292

* In process of completion from Indian cadres.

9. It may be observed that the increase of numbers shown in section 8 does not represent an increased charge for non-effective. It signifies merely that the number added to the British *list* has been subtracted from the Indian *lists*. Neither does it signify any variation in the incidence of non-effective charge as between the Imperial and Indian exchequers; inasmuch as that charge is dependent on the proportion between the *establishments* maintained in and out of India, and not on the promotional lists (with the small exception that officers on the Indian lists have, in some cases, better retiring pensions than those on the British list).

10. On the principles of calculation shown above, we find that the probable service of the officers on the British list during the next 10 years will be as follows on promotion.

	Total Service on Promotion to the Rank of—				
	General Officer.	Colonel.	Lt.-Colonel.	Major.	Captain.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
End of year 1875	41	31	25	19	13
„ 1876	40	31	25	19	13
„ 1877	41	31	25	20	13
„ 1878	41	32	26	21	14
„ 1879	41	32	27	22	14
„ 1880	42	33	27	22	14
„ 1881	40	34	28	22	14
„ 1882	41	34	28	23	14
„ 1883	42	34	29	23	14
„ 1884	42	34	30	24	14
„ 1885	43	35	30	24	14

11. The promotion to be looked for in the Normal shown in our Report, No. 99. (App. E.)

DENHAM ROBINSON.
19th November 1875. ROBERT DAVEY.

PART II.—Royal Engineers.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 124.)

1. The retirements now open to the British list of the Royal Engineers are three in number,—

(*a.*) Voluntary pensions of 600*l.* a year, available for general officers or colonels after 40 years' service :

(*b.*) Voluntary pensions after 30 years' service of 474*l.* 10*s.* to colonels, or 365*l.* to lieutenant-colonels ; up to a maximum of 21,500*l.* a year. A supplementary pension is given to the colonels in consideration of vested interests acquired before 1872. This supplementary pension will gradually diminish until extinguished.

(*c.*) Half-pay after 25 years' service.

2. As regards the pension of 600*l.* after 40 years' service, no instance of its acceptance has yet occurred since the warrant of July 1872. In our calculation we have assumed that every officer entitled to it will take this pension whenever its value to him exceeds the value of his prospective pay on the active list as colonel, general officer unattached, and colonel commandant. It will not, on this assumption, be accepted before 1878.

3. Up to this time there has been a rare acceptance of the pension of 474*l.* 10*s.* (with an addition), and 2,736*l.* out of the 21,500*l.* allowed for retirement is still open. For calculation, we have worked on two extreme assumptions :

1°. That all will serve till they have completed 40 years' service or more, and can retire on 600*l.* a year ; and that then they will retire as explained in § 2. This represents the slowest promotion which can reasonably be expected.

2°. That the 21,500*l.* will always be kept full by officers retiring on an average pension of 550*l.* as soon after completing 30 years' service as they become colonels and there is money available ; also that those not so retiring will retire on 600*l.* after 40 or more years' service, if it is to their advantage, under § 2. This shows the quickest promotion likely to be attained under the existing system.

4. With reference to half-pay retirement after 25 years' service, it is so very rarely accepted that we have left it out of consideration.

5. The gradual extinction of the three Indian cadres of officers and their replacement by British officers will cause, for many years, certain steps of promotion to fall to the latter. To ascertain the probable number of these steps we have found the average rate of depletion in each Indian rank during the period 1863–1875, being the period during which they have formed a portion of the British army, We have made allowance for the steps thus gained for the British lists in the ranks of captain and major during the period under consideration.

6. As part of the arrangement made in 1872, there was an understanding that lieutenant-colonels and colonels holding certain extra-regimental appointments, should be made supernumerary whenever the senior major reached a service of 25 years. This arrangement had operated to a considerable extent, when it was suspended pending the report of the Royal Commission. We understand that, if the rule were in operation, 5 might be added to the lieutenant-colonels.

7. The numbers with which we have to deal are :—

	Total.
General officers - - - - -	19
Colonels - - - - -	21
Lieut.-colonels - - - - -	53
Majors - - - - -	78
Captains - - - - -	127*
Lieutenants - - - - -	372
Total British and Amalgamated list -	670

* In process of completion from Indian cadres.

These numbers reach (from augmentations under sections 5 and 6) by the end of 1885, the following :—

	Total.
General officers - - - -	19
Colonels - - - -	21
Lieut.-colonels - - - -	58
Majors - - - -	100*
Captains - - - -	185
Lieutenants - - - -	372
Total - - -	755

* In process of completion from Indian cadres.

8. It may be observed that the increase of numbers shown in section 7 does not represent an increased charge for non-effective. It signifies merely that the number added to the British *list* has been subtracted from the

APP. L.

Indian *lists*. Neither does it signify any variation in the incidence of non-effective charge as between the Imperial and Indian exchequers; inasmuch as that charge is dependent on the proportion between the *establishments* maintained in and out of India, and not on the promotional lists (with the small exception that officers on the Indian lists have, in some cases, better retiring pensions than those on the British list).

9. On the principles of calculation shown above, we find that the probable service of the officers on the British list during the next 10 years will lie between the following extremes.

[SLOWEST PROMOTION.]

—	Total Service on Promotion to the Rank of—				
	General Officer.	Colonel.	Lieut.-Colonel.	Major.	Captain.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
End of year 1875 -	41	33	26	19	13
„ 1876 -	42	33	26	20	14
„ 1877 -	42	33	25	20	14
„ 1878 -	40	34	25	21	14
„ 1879 -	40	34	25	22	15
„ 1880 -	40	35	26	23	15
„ 1881 -	41	36	27	23	16
„ 1882 -	41	37	28	24	15
„ 1883 -	42	37	29	25	15
„ 1884 -	42	38	29	25	16
„ 1885 -	42	38	30	25	16

[QUICKEST PROMOTION.]

—	Total Service on Promotion to the Rank of—				
	General Officer.	Colonel.	Lieut.-Colonel.	Major.	Captain.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
End of year 1875 -	41	33	26	19	13
„ 1876 -	42	32	24	19	14
„ 1877 -	42	32	24	20	14
„ 1878 -	40	33	24	21	14
„ 1879 -	40	33	25	22	14
„ 1880 -	40	34	26	22	15
„ 1881 -	41	35	27	23	14
„ 1882 -	41	36	27	24	14
„ 1883 -	40	36	28	24	15
„ 1884 -	41	37	29	24	15
„ 1885 -	41	36	30	24	16

10. Comparing with our report No. 113 on the Royal Artillery, it will be seen that the Royal Engineers are at a disadvantage in regard to the period of attaining the ranks of colonel and captain.

11. The promotion to be expected in the Normal is shown in our Report, No. 99. (App. E.)

DENHAM ROBINSON.
ROBERT DAVEY.

15th February 1876.

APP. M.

APPENDIX M.

EQUIVALENT ANNUITIES.

QUESTIONS FOR THE WAR OFFICE ACTUARIES.

Assume that officers enter the service at the age of 20, and that, at whatever ages they are allowed to retire, the numbers on the effective list remain the same.

1. Is it possible to draw up a scale of annuities which might be granted to officers at any age, without regard to the numbers accepting them, at the same cost to the public as if all remained in the service for a given period, and at the end of that period retired with the same pension?

2. If so, what pensions might be given to officers of less than 20 years' service without involving any greater expense to the public than if all retired with a pension of 200*l.* a year on completing 20 years' service?

In answering these questions give any explanations which may be necessary of the sense in which the large and smaller pensions are "equivalents," and add, as illustrations, one or two other scales of annuities worked from different bases.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 114.)

1. If the principle of early retirement be conceded, and if a certain pension be fixed upon as applicable to a given age (or to a given period of service, which is nearly the same thing) there is a scale of pensions for earlier or later ages (or periods of service) which shall not involve, as regards the retirement, any greater cost to the State.

For example, if 200*l.* a year at the age 40 (after 20 years' service, the basis laid down in question 2,) be adopted as a standard pension, 384*l.* a year at the age 50 (30 years' service) or 87*l.* a year at the age 30 (10 years' service) would represent an equal charge to the State.

2. The gradation of these pensions is dependent on two causes: First, as the age of retirement increases, the period during which a life pension will be held of course decreases and a larger pension can be granted. This, however, accounts but for a small portion of the alteration in the pensions. For example, the pension quoted in § 1 would be at age 50, 236*l.*, and at age 30, 183*l.* a year, if merely the change of age were considered.

The second and greater cause of variation is that for every lengthening or shortening of the period of service by later or earlier retirement a corresponding decrease or increase takes place in the number of entrants at the age for commencing service. The survivors of these entrants are proportionate; and as the effective list remains constant, it follows that the number on the retired list will be larger or smaller as the entrants increase or decrease in number. With an increased number of entrants (which is equivalent to a decrease in the average period of service) the pension has to be reduced below that involved by the age being younger; and with a decreased number of entrants (representing an average increased length of service) it becomes possible, without augmenting the burden on the State, to give a larger pension than the mere addition to the age would justify.

3. For the calculation of "equivalent annuities" the following points must be fixed:—

(*a.*) A pension at a given age (*e.g.*, 200*l.* a year at 40).
(*b.*) The year of entering the service (*e.g.*, 20).
(*c.*) The value of money (*e.g.*, 5 per cent.).
(*d.*) The number non-effective, if any, above the given age at rates of pension different from the datum.

4. The nearer any rates for retirement can be made to harmonize with a scale of "equivalent annuities," the nearer will the non-effective charge be constant, whatever re-organization of the proportions between the ranks may take place. If the scale were absolutely adhered to, the non-effective charge could not vary in the normal, however the proportions of ranks might be changed.

5. With "equivalent annuities" it is immaterial, so far as the non-effective charge is concerned, whether many, or few, or none elect to retire at any particular age.

6. The action of this system would not be to give all officers pensions equal in value, without respect to the length of their service, though it would disregard the rank held at the time of leaving the army; for, although the "equivalent annuities" represent a precisely equal cost to the public, they are far from being of equal value to the individual recipients. The following table shows, in column 1, the annuities equivalent in *cost to the public* to 200*l.* after 20 years' service (age 40); and in column 2, the annuity after each year's service equal in *value to the officer* to an annuity of 200*l.* after 20 years' service (age 40).

It will be seen that, under the "Equivalent Annuities," there is a very perceptible reward for length of service.

7. In the following tables the point (*d.*) of § 3 is assumed as *nil*. In cases like the Artillery, where a residuum of aged officers remain (under the name of General Officers) at a higher average pension side by side with those retired through old age, the equivalent annuities would be smaller at lower ages than those stated in the following tables.

[Equivalent Annuities on the Basis of 200*l.* a Year after 20 Years' Service, with Entries at 20 Years of Age] :—

Years' Service.	Age last Birthday.	1. Equivalent Annuity in *Cost to Public* to 200*l.* a year at age 40 [5 per cent.].	2. Equal Annuity in *Value to Officer* to 200*l.* a year at age 40 [5 per cent.].	3. Commutation Value [5 per cent.] of Annuity in Col. (1).	3. Commutation Value [5 per cent.] of Annuity in Col. (2).
		£	£	£	£
40	60	726	296	6,506	
35	55	521	263	5,246	
34	54	490	257	5,042	
33	53	466	252	4,848	
32	52	434	246	4,659	
31	51	408	241	4,482	
30	50	384	236	4,304	
29	49	361	231	4,134	
28	48	339	227	3,963	
27	47	318	222	3,794	
26	46	299	218	3,626	
25	45	280	214	3,457	
24	44	262	211	3,293	
23	43	246	208	3,126	
22	42	229	205	2,963	
21	41	214	202	2,803	
20	**40**	**200**	**200**	**2,649**	2,649
19	39	187	198	2,499	
18	38	174	196	2,356	
17	37	162	194	2,215	
16	36	151	192	2,078	
15	35	139	190	1,939	
14	34	129	189	1,800	
13	33	118	187	1,665	
12	32	107	186	1,527	
11	31	98	185	1,391	
10	30	87	183	1,255	
9	29	78	182	1,121	
8	28	68	181	987	
7	27	59	180	859	
6	26	50	180	730	
5	25	41	179	604	

8. The following tables show "equivalent annuities" with different bases to the foregoing :—

[On the Basis of 200*l.* a Year at age 42, with Entries at 19 Years of Age.]

Years of completed Service.	Age last Birthday.	Annuity on Retirement.	Capitalized Value of Annuity. 4 per cent.	Capitalized Value of Annuity. 5 per cent.*
		£	£	£
41	60	641	6,249	5,743
40	59	595	5,979	5,476
39	58	553	5,727	5,215
38	57	516	5,489	4,976
37	56	482	5,264	4,754
36	55	451	5,056	4,551
35	54	424	4,863	4,366
34	53	398	4,676	4,192
33	52	375	4,502	4,029
32	51	353	4,343	3,874
31	50	332	4,167	3,724
30	49	312	4,004	3,579
29	48	294	3,844	3,436
28	47	276	3,684	3,294
27	46	259	3,526	3,152
26	45	243	3,368	3,009
25	44	228	3,211	2,868
24	43	214	3,054	2,724
23	**42**	**200**	**2,901**	**2,585**
22	41	187	2,751	2,448
21	40	175	2,605	2,315
20	39	163	2,464	2,188
19	38	153	2,329	2,064
18	37	142	2,196	1,944
17	36	132	2,065	1,826
16	35	123	1,937	1,710
15	34	114	1,807	1,593
14	33	104	1,678	1,476
13	32	95	1,549	1,360
12	31	87	1,420	1,244
11	30	78	1,292	1,129
10	29	70	1,166	1,017
9	28	62	1,041	906
8	27	54	918	798
7	26	47	797	692

* Being the rate for Government commutation.

[On the Basis of the Annuity which 1,800*l.* would purchase after 20 Years' Service, with Entries at 19 Years of Age] :— App. M.

Years of completed Service.	Age last Birthday.	Capitalised value of Annuity.	Annuity at Commutation Rates. (5 per cent.)	Annuity with money at 4 per cent.
		£	£	£
41	60	4,565	510	468
40	59	4,367	475	434
39	58	4,183	444	404
38	57	4,010	416	377
37	56	3,845	390	352
36	55	3,693	366	330
35	54	3,552	345	310
34	53	3,418	325	291
33	52	3,289	306	274
32	51	3,165	288	258
31	50	3,044	271	243
30	49	2,925	255	228
29	48	2,807	240	215
28	47	2,692	224	202
27	46	2,575	212	190
26	45	2,460	199	178
25	44	2,345	187	167
24	43	2,231	175	156
23	42	2,119	164	146
22	41	2,009	154	137
21	40	1,902	144	128
20	**39**	**1,800**	**135**	**119**
19	38	1,700	126	111
18	37	1,603	117	104
17	36	1,509	109	97
16	35	1,415	102	90
15	34	1,320	94	83
14	33	1,226	87	76
13	32	1,132	79	70
12	31	1,037	72	63
11	30	944	65	57
10	29	851	59	51
9	28	760	52	45
8	27	670	46	40
7	26	582	40	34

[On the Basis of an Annuity of 600*l.* a Year at the Age of 60 Years, with Entries at 20 Years of Age] :—

Years of completed Service.	Age last Birthday.	Annuity equivalent in cost to public.	Commutation value of Annuity. (5 per cent.)
		£	£
40	**60**	**600**	**5,378**
35	55	481	4,336
34	54	405	4,168
33	53	380	4,006
32	52	359	3,851
31	51	337	3,705
30	50	317	3,558
29	49	298	3,418
28	48	280	3,275
27	47	263	3,136
26	46	247	2,997
25	45	232	2,858
24	44	217	2,722
23	43	203	2,584
22	42	189	2,449
21	41	177	2,317
20	40	165	2,190
19	39	155	2,065
18	38	144	1,947
17	37	134	1,831
16	36	125	1,718
15	35	115	1,603
14	34	107	1,488
13	33	98	1,376
12	32	89	1,263
11	31	81	1,150
10	30	72	1,037
9	29	65	927
8	28	56	816
7	27	49	710
6	26	41	603
5	25	34	499

November, 1875.

Denham Robinson.
Robert Davey.

APP. N.

APPENDIX N.

Proposal for a Re-distribution of the Ranks in the Officers' Grade, which would obviate the Necessity of Compulsory Retirement in the Rank of Captain.

(Handed in for the consideration of the Commission.)

Infantry.

Proposed establishment for two linked-battalions, one at home and the other abroad :—

At Home.	Cost.			Abroad.	Cost.		
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Head-Quarters, 1 Lieutenant-Colonel -	365	0	0	Head-Quarters, 1 Lieut-Col. commanding -	365	0	0
„ 4 Majors - -	1,168	0	0	„ 1 Lieutenant-Colonel -	310	5	0
„ 4 Captains - - -	845	11	8	„ 4 Majors - - -	1,168	0	0
„ 1 do. Adjutant - -	211	7	11	„ 4 Captains - -	845	11	8
„ 12 Subalterns { 8 at 6s. 6d. -	949	0	0	„ 1 do. Adjutant - -	211	7	11
„ { 4 at 5s. 3d. -	383	5	0	„ 16 Subalterns { 12 at 6s. 6d.	1,423	10	0
				{ 4 at 5s. 3d.	383	5	0
	£3922	4	7		£4,706	19	7
Depôt.				Depôt.			
„ 1 Lieutenant-Colonel -	310	5	0	„ 1 Captain - - -	211	7	11
„ 1 Captain - - -	211	7	11	„ 2 Subalterns - -	237	5	0
„ 2 Subalterns - - -	237	5	0				
	£4,681	2	6		£5,155	12	6

Total number of officers in the two battalions :—

Head Quarters, 4 Lieutenant-Colonels.
„ 8 Majors.
„ 12 Captains.
„ 32 Subalterns.

56

Proportion of Field Officers to Captains and Subalterns.

1 to ·3·66

The present establishment is as follows :—

At Home.	Cost.			Abroad.	Cost.		
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Head-Quarters, 1 Lieutenant-Colonel -	365	0	0	Head-Quarters, 1 Lieutenant-Colonel -	365	0	0
„ 1 Major - -	292	0	0	„ 2 Majors - - -	584	0	0
„ 8 Captains - - -	1,691	13	4	„ 8 Captains - -	1,691	13	4
„ 13 Subalterns { 8 at 6s. 6d. -	949	0	0	„ 17 Subalterns { 10 at 6s. 6d.	1,186	5	0
„ { 5 at 5s. 3d. -	479	1	3	{ 7 at 5s. 3d.	670	13	9
„ 1 Adjutant - - -	182	10	0	„ 1 Adjutant - -	182	10	0
„ 1 Instructor Musketry (extra pay) - - -	45	12	6	„ 1 Instructor Musketry (extra pay) - -	45	12	6
	£4,004	17	1		£4,725	14	7
Depôt.				Depôt.			
„ 1 Major - - -	292	0	0	„ 2 Captains - -	422	15	10
„ 2 Captains - - -	422	15	10	„ 2 Subalterns - -	237	5	0
„ 2 Subalterns - - -	237	5	0				
	£4956	17	11		£5,385	15	5

Total number of officers in the two battalions :—

Head Quarters, 2 Lieutenant-Colonels.
„ 4 Majors.
„ 20 Captains.
„ 36 Subalterns.

62

Proportion of Field Officers to Captains and Subalterns.

1 to 9·22.

INFANTRY.—(*continued.*) APP. N.

In the new organization suggested above it is proposed to divide the Battalion into four companies, each to consist of—

Major.	Captain.	Sub-alterns.	Company Sergeant Major.	Company Qr. Mr. Sergeant.	Sergeants.	Corporals. 1st	Corporals. 2nd	Buglers	Pioneers.	Rank and File.	Remarks.
1	1	4 abroad 3 at home.	1	1	8 abroad 6 at home.	8	4*	4	3 abroad 2 at home.	120† to 250	* In lieu of Lance-Corporals. † According to circumstances.

The Adjutant to be a Captain and take charge and payment of the Staff Sergeants and of the band.

The present grade and duties of Regimental Majors to be abolished and in lieu a second Lieutenant-Colonel appointed.

The second Lieutenant-Colonel to accompany the Battalion abroad to assist the Lieutenant-Colonel commanding, or to replace him in case of sickness, or when on leave of absence.

At home the second Lieutenant-Colonel to take command of the Depôts of both Battalions.

The special appointment of Musketry Instructors to be abolished, the Musketry Instruction to be carried out by the officers of companies.

If the officers employed on the Staff were seconded, there would be as many officers available for duty under this arrangement as at present.

Cavalry.

In this branch of the service the only changes required in the officers' grade would be:

1. To give the squadron leaders the rank of Major and the command of the squadron in quarters as well as in the field, and
2. To give the present major the rank of 2nd Lieut.-Colonel.

In the re-distribution proposed, the proportion of officers in the various grades in the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, Cavalry, and Infantry are similar.

In Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, it is not considered that compulsory retirement in the rank of Captain will be required; if, therefore, the various grades of officers are assimilated in all branches of the service, compulsory retirements in the rank of Captain may probably be dispensed wth altogether.

The principle of reducing the number of companies in the battalion, at the same time that their strength is increased, has been adopted by all foreign armies, and its introduction into our service for tactical reasons has been for some time advocated by a large number of experienced officers in our army.

APPENDIX O. APP. O.

THE EFFECTS OF REORGANIZATION ON THE PROSPECTS OF OFFICERS AND ON THE COST OF RETIREMENT, &c.

QUESTION FOR THE WAR OFFICE ACTUARIES.

In what way would the rate of promotion, cost of retirement, and the prospects of officers entering the service be affected by a re-arrangement of the ranks such as that suggested in Appendix N.; supposing all officers employed on the staff to be made supernumerary, as proposed in Recommendation 28?

REPORT. (No. 135.)

[INFANTRY ONLY.]

1. In Appendix N. the following is shown to be the establishment of one sub-district brigade (with the commandant of the brigade depôt added):—

1 brevet colonel (brigade depôt.)	
2 lieut.-colonels.	
4 majors.	
20 captains.	
36 subalterns	2 adjutants.
	34 lieutenants.
63	

There are 70 sub-district brigades of infantry, and the share of the 275 general officers assigned to the Guards and Line which would fall to one sub-district brigade is 3·21, and as far as can be deduced from the scheme for the mobilization of the forces, &c., the following would be the addition of supernumeraries for staff employment, &c., under recommendation **28** of the Royal Commission:—

Colonels - - -	2·43
Majors - - -	1·
Captains - - -	4·56
	7·99

Taking the brigade depôt commandant to be a colonel, we have thus the following cadre:—

3·21 general officers	1·60 honorary colonels.
	1·61 unattached.
3·43 colonels.	
2· lieut.-colonels.	
5· majors.	
24·56 captains.	
36· subalterns.	
Total 74·20	

for a sub-district brigade, and this we assume as the unit of Infantry organization.

These numbers being based on the recommendation of the Commission that staff officers shall all be supernumerary, and also on the staff requirements of mobilisation, amount in themselves to a reorganization of the ranks as compared with existing numbers, the proportion in the upper grades being increased.

2. Assuming no other exit to exist but that afforded by the recruitment of the Indian Staff Corps and the compulsory retirement which the Commission suggests, viz., brevet colonels to vacate staff appointments after 5 years, and to retire at 55 if not promoted; the lieut.-colonels to vacate after five years; majors after 7 years (provided they have 27 years' service in all); and captains after 20 years' service; we obtain the following ages on attaining the several ranks, number retiring annually, and number always retired or unemployed:—

—	Age on becoming	Service on becoming	70 Sub-districts. No. quitting annually.	70 Sub-districts. Numbers retired or unemployed.	Rate of Pension.
					£
Subaltern - -	20	—	—	—	—
Captain - -	30½	10½	117	3,168	200
Major - -	40	20	—	—	—
Lieut.-Colonels -	47	27	—	—	—
Staff Colonel -	49½	29½	31	534	550
Major-General -	55	35	—	—	—
Lieut.-General -	65	45	—	—	—
General - -	74	54	—	—	—

On this supposition the number of officers entering the infantry yearly would be 315.

APP. O.

The annual charge would be :—	£
Effective pay	883,890
Non-effective [commuted] at the rates proposed by Commission	565,110
	1,449,000

	£
The present value of his prospects to an officer on first joining would be	3,184
And the annual cost to public per effective officer	292
Number of persons withdrawn from civil occupation for infantry	12,190

[This organization will only admit of service as regimental lieutenant-colonel and staff-colonel, together, extending over eight years.]

3. In § 2 is shown the effect of promotion produced by certain retirements acting on a given cadre of officers. It is possible to produce the same promotion *without any retirement* in a cadre comprising the same number of officers, by re-arranging the proportions of the several ranks.

The proportions required to effect this result would be :—

	Required number.		
General officers	19·26	instead of	3·21
Colonels	6·35	,,	3·43
Lieutenant-colonels	3·05	,,	2.
Majors	9·12	,,	5.
Captains	13·71	,,	24·56
Subalterns	22·71	,,	36.
	74·20		74·20

The annual entries would be 220.

The annual charge :—	£
Effective pay	803,820
Non-effective	372,800
	1,176,620

Present value to entrant 3,755*l.*
Charge to public per effective officer, 306*l.*
Number of persons withdrawn from civil occupation, 8,527.

4. The proportion shown in § 3 gives the smallest possible withdrawal of persons from civil occupation, and the smallest cost (with existing rates of pay) at which the promotion in § 2 could be procured. It gives also the highest present value to the entrant, which could be obtained without involving the public in a larger expenditure.

The effect of this re-arrangement is greatly to decrease the number of officers in each brigade below the age of 55, and therefore effective. In the cadre shown in §2 there were 70·99 effective officers below the age of 55, while in this cadre there are but 54·94; which will account for the cost per effective officer rising from 292*l.* to 306*l.*, notwithstanding that the total cost has fallen from 1,449,000*l.* to 1,176,620*l.*

5. Assuming now that the same number of effective officers below 55 years of age (viz. 70·99) must be retained, and the same periods of promotion as shown in § 2, the organization which would allow of such a result, without any other retirement than that of those colonels at the age of 55 (on 550*l.* a year) who fail to enter the fixed establishment of 3·21 general officers, would be as follows :—

General officers	3·21		3·21
Colonels	8·40	instead of	3·43
Lieut.-colonels	4·04	,,	2·
Majors	12·09	,,	5·
Captains	18·18	,,	24·56
Subalterns	28·28	,,	36·
	74·20		74·20

This would give annual entries, 259.

Annual charge :—	
Effective pay	£1,052,450
Non-effective	582,600
	£1,635,050

Present value to entrant	£3,904
Charge to public per effective officer	329
Number of persons withdrawn from civil occupation	10,045

6. Comparison between §§ 5 and 3.—The increase of the body of officers below the age of 55 has raised the entrants from 220 to 259, and consequently the body withdrawn from civil occupation is increased.

The effective charge is higher than in § 3, in the same proportion as the effective officers have been increased in number. The non-effective is increased for two reasons; first, because a larger body (70·99 instead 54·94) below the age of 55 involves a proportionately larger body above it; and, secondly, because the pension of 550*l.* falling to the great majority of these officers is of higher value than the average pay as general officer (viz. 478*l.**) accruing to the augmented list (19·26) of general officers in § 3.

The reasons for an increased non-effective charge also prevail to cause an increased present value to the entrant (3,904*l.* instead of 3,755*l.*), and an increased charge to the public for each effective officer.

7. Comparison between §§ 5 and 2.—It is desirable to inquire why the theoretical establishment in § 5, while giving only the same promotion, should exceed in cost (1,635,050*l.* against 1,449,000*l.*; or 329*l.* per effective officer against 292*l.*) the establishment in § 2.

The answer is summed up in the respective present values to the entrant, viz., 3,904*l.* in § 5 against only 3,184 in § 2. In other words, the comparative cheapness in § 2 is obtained at the expense of the officers; the proportions between the ranks involving the compulsory retirement on 200*l.* a year, from active military life and from prospective promotion, of more than two thirds of the number of officers who reach the rank of captain.

The increased effective charge (from 883,890*l.* to 1,052,450*l.*) is dependent on the reorganized proportions between the ranks.

8. The system of double companies sketched in Appendix N. would give an establishment approaching somewhat to the establishment in § 5.

This, altered to suit mobilization, is as follows :—

	Home Battalion, (4 double Companies).	Foreign Battalion, (4 double Companies).	Depôt, (2 double Companies).	For Staff, &c., under Mobilization.	General Officers, as at present.	Total.
General Officers	—	—	—	—	3·21	3·21
Colonels	—	—	1	2·43	—	3·43
Lieut.-Colonels	1	2	1	—	—	4·
Majors	4	4	—	1·	—	9·
Captains (including Adjutants).	5	5	2	4·56	—	16·56
Subalterns	12	16	4	—	—	32·
	22	27	8	7·99	3·21	68·20

9. The results obtained from the cadre in § 8 are as follows :—

	Age on becoming	Service on becoming	No. quitting annually.	Numbers retired or unemployed.	Rate of Pension.
	Years.	Years.	No.	No.	£
Subaltern	20	—	95	—†	—
Captain	31½	11½	39	1,057	200
Major	40	20	17	383	300
Lieut.-Colonel	47	27	—	—	—
Staff-Colonel	51	31	48	841	550
Major-General	55	35	—	—	—
Lieut.-General	65	45	—	—	—
General	74	54	—	—	—

Annual entries	268
Annual charge :—	£
Effective pay	870,660
Non-effective pay	517,300
	1,387,960

* The average pay of a general officer falls as the number is increased inasmuch as the number of honorary colonelcies does not increase.
† In Indian Staff Corps.

Present value to entrant - -	£3,490
Charge to public per effective officer -	£305
Number of persons withdrawn from civil occupation - -	10,370

10. It will be seen from the foregoing calculations that the effect of reorganization such as that suggested in Appendix N., would be:—

1. To increase the value of the prospects of an officer entering the service from 3,184*l.* to 3,490*l.*, which represents a very large increase of income late in life.
2. To reduce the compulsory retirements annually from the rank of captain from 117 to 39.
3. To save 31,040*l.* in the annual cost of the infantry.

On the other hand, such a reorganization involves a reduction in the number of effective officers from 4,729 to 4,309, or 8·9 per cent.

11. It will be observed in all these cadres that the rank of captain is never attained until after the age of 30 years. Under Purchase, the average service as subaltern was 9 years, and officers entered 2 or 3 years earlier in life than they do now. If it be required that captains should be as young as formerly, that result can only be secured with the present age of entry by a compulsory retirement of subalterns, so long as the existing proportion between subalterns and captains is maintained. If the preponderance of the subalterns could be reduced, service as subalterns might be shortened. The effect would be to increase the value of an appointment by bringing-nearer promotion to captain, and by lessening the compulsory retirement from that rank. Assuming that the total number of officers in each company (or double company) below the captain cannot be reduced, one in each double company might perhaps be replaced by an officer promoted from the ranks, (say at the average age of 28), to serve to the age of 48, but not to have any further claim to promotion. Such an officer would correspond in position to the present quartermaster, and could receive the same pay and retirement; and, in the absence of another name, he is so called in this paper. The measure would produce the following altered condition of promotion, &c. among the remaining officers. The cost of the effective list with the reorganized cadre in § (8) would be increased by 36,260*l.*, and that of the non-effective list decreased by 23,218*l.* 700 commissions would be opened, in the infantry, to non-commissioned officers, which could scarcely fail to stimulate recruiting, &c.

—	Age on becoming	Service on becoming	No. quitting annually.	Numbers retired or unemployed.	Rate of Pension.
					£
Subaltern - -	20	—	95	—*	—
Captain - -	29½	9½	8	214	200
Major - -	40	20	17	383	300
Lieut.-Colonel -	47	27	Nil	None	—
Staff Colonel -	52	32	48	841	550
Major-General -	55	35	—	—	—
Lieut.-General -	65	45	—	—	—
General - -	74	54	—	—	—

* In Indian Staff Corps.

Annual entries - - (exclusive of quartermasters).	228
Annual charge:—	£
Effective pay -	906,920
Non-effective pay -	500,360
Total (including quartermasters)	1,407,280
Saving on pensions of soldiers promoted to be quartermasters	6,278
Net-total	1,401,002
Present value to entrant (not including quartermasters)	4,021*l.*
Charge to public per effective officer (including quartermasters)	309*l.*

Number of persons withdrawn from civil occupation (not including quartermasters), 8,849.

12. In all the organizations shown in this report, voluntary retirement has been excluded from consideration Consequently the periods for promotion are stated at their maximum, and any voluntary retirement would reduce one or other of those periods. In all the cadres voluntary resignation of subalterns or captains would reduce the period of service as subaltern. Voluntary resignation as captain would be unlikely to be so extensive as to expedite promotion to major in any cadre except that in § 10. In the ranks of major and lieutenant-colonel voluntary retirement could scarcely affect promotion.

13. In all cases there has been assumed an exit of 95 officers annually to the Indian Staff Corps at the average age of 24.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
9th June 1876. ROBERT DAVEY.

APPENDIX P.

COMPARISON OF THE PECUNIARY VALUE TO OFFICERS OF INFANTRY OF THE LINE OF THE PROPOSALS OF THE COMMISSION WITH THAT OF THE PROPOSALS MADE BY THE LATE ROYAL COMMISSION ON OFFICERS' MEMORIALS.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY.

The object of this paper is to show, as nearly as can be calculated, the extent of the pecuniary benefit which officers now serving in the Infantry of the Line, who entered the service before purchase was abolished, would receive if the proposals of the Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials were carried out, as compared with the pecuniary benefit which they would receive from the proposals now made.

It will be seen that the recommendations of the present Commission are, on the whole, considerably more advantageous to the officers concerned, as a body, than those for which it is proposed to substitute them.

16th July 1876. T. D. PIGOTT.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 133.)

1. By direction of the Royal Commission we have endeavoured to institute a comparison between the sums which (all pensions being commuted) would fall to the officers, now surviving, who were in the Infantry of the Line in 1871, under their recommendations, and under the recommendations of the late Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials.

2. The conditions of service are so different that comparison can only be made on the assumption of some common basis. Variation in the basis might materially alter the result. We have assumed for the present calculation that promotion shall be equally maintained under either system at the average rates which held under Purchase, viz.:

Captain, after 9 years' service.
Major „ 19 „
Lt.-Colonel 23½ „

and that officers exceeding such service retire on the best terms open to them under the system concerned. These terms are shown in the annexed table in the column headed "Value," and are based upon the probable operation of the respective schemes as affecting the interests of the officers. We have supposed that as many as can will take the alternative of the system in question, which represents the highest capitalized value, and then that the other alternatives of the same system, in the order of value, will be taken to their limit.

APP. P.

3. The ranks in which officers would quit their regiments, and the sums they would realize, are shown in the following table:

Rank held in 1871.	Rank in which quitting Regiment.	Promotion Commission. No.		Value.	Sum realized.		Officers' Memorials Commission. No.		Value.	Sum realized.	
				£	£	£			£	£	£
Lieut.-Colonel	Lieut.-Colonel -	67		7,171	480,500		67		7,171	480,500	
			67			480,500		67			480,500
Major - -	Major - -	82		4,689	384,400		82		4,689	384,400	
	Lieut.-Colonel -	132		6,118	807,600		132		6,240	823,700	
			214			1,192,000		214			1,208,100
Captain - -	Captain - -	605		3,200	1,936,000		591		2,414	1,427,000	
	Major - -	266		3,271	870,000		295		3,814	1,126,000	
	Lieut.-Colonel -	269		5,256	1,415,000		254		5,114	1,299,000	
			1,140			4,221,000		1,140			3,852,000
Lieutenant -	Lieutenant - -	755		995	751,100		755		800	603,900	
	Captain - -	337		2,705	911,600		269		1,385	372,700	
	Major - -	81		3,271	265,000		176		3,300	580,800	
	Lieut.-Colonel -	169		4,936	834,290		153		4,804	735,000	
			1,342			2,761,990		1,353			2,292,400
Ensign - -	Lieutenant - -	58		995	57,710		58		450	26,100	
	Captain - -	281		2,705	560,200		228		1,135	258,700	
	Major - -	63		3,271	206,000		84		3,200	268,700	
	Lieut.-Colonel -	102		4,910	500,800		124		4,704	583,300	
			504			1,324,710		494			1,136,800
			3,267			9,980,200		3,268			8,969,800

4. The following are the numbers according to ranks in which the officers would quit the regiments from causes other than death. The incidence of promotion is not quite the same under the two systems: for although by our hypothesis in §2 the total service of officers at the time of promotion is to be the same, the rules for the tenure as regimental major are different. The result is that fewer officers would attain the rank of Major under the recommendations of the Royal Commission than under the conditions laid down by the Commission on Officers' Memorials.

Rank in which retired.	Promotion Commission.	Officers' Memorials Commission.
Lt.-Colonel - - - -	739	730
Major - - - - -	492	637
Captain - - - -	1,223	1,088
Lieutenant - - - -	883	813
	3,267	3,268

5. Under the scheme of the Officers' Memorials Commission, the Purchase officers will all have been cleared out from the Infantry by 1901, while under the scheme of the Royal Commission some will survive till 1902.

Denham Robinson,
Robert Davey.

10th May 1876.

APP. Q.

APPENDIX Q.

Statement of the Average Sums allowed as "Bonus" to Officers retiring on Full Pay.

The average sums allowed by the Army Purchase Commissioners as "bonus" to officers retiring on full pay since the abolition of purchase have been in the Infantry as follows:—

For Lieutenant-Colonels - 3,225*l.*
For Majors - - - 1,960*l.*
For Captains - - - 831*l.*
For Lieutenants - - 200*l.*

No Cavalry officers have up to this date retired on full pay since the abolition of purchase.

9th December 1875. Edward Lugard.

The average sums allowed as the "over regulation" value of the commissions of officers of Infantry, as stated in a return published in the Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials, are as follows:

For Lieutenant-Colonels - 2,435*l.*
For Majors - - 1,489*l.*
For Captains - - 614*l.*
For Lieutenants - - 100*l.*

APP. R.

APPENDIX R.

Number of Brevet Colonels and their probable Age on becoming General Officers, on the assumption that no Special Retirements are offered to them.

Question for the War Office Actuaries.

Assume the scheme of the Commission to be working up to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, but not farther.

How many brevet-colonels would be annually removed from regiments by the five years' rule?

How long would they be, on the average, on half-pay?

At what age could they attain the rank of major-general?

Actuaries' Report. (No. 115.)

1. Taking regimental promotion to act as shown in Actuaries' Report, No. 112 [App.], at the mean rate, we find that the following lieutenant-colonels would annually be removed from regiments:—

Household Cavalry - - ·6
Cavalry - - - - 6·
Foot Guards - - - ·6
Infantry - - - - 29·
36·2

2. The survivors of these officers would, in the normal, number 798 of guards and line, of whom 275 would be general officers; there would therefore be 523 holding the rank of colonel. Staff and other employment could be found for 120, leaving 403 on half-pay.

3. The average period on half-pay, assuming the employment when obtained to last for five years, would be 13½ years.

4. The age on becoming major-general would be—

Household Cavalry - - 60
Cavalry - - - - 62
Foot Guards and Infantry - - 65
Average - - - 64

5. These conclusions are based on the assumption that there is no retirement of any sort in operation.

Denham Robinson.
6th December 1875. Robert Davey.

APPENDIX S.

Cadre for the Corps of Royal Engineers.

Question for War Office Actuaries.

What cadre of Royal Engineers would secure promotion (on the average) after the following service :—

To captain after - - 11½ years' service.
To major after - - 19 „ „
To lieutenant-colonel after 25 „ „

On the following assumptions :—

1. That the total number of officers from lieut.-colonel downwards (both British and Indian lists) remain as at present.
2. That the proposals of the Commission with regard to Royal Artillery be applied equally to the Royal Engineers.
3. That voluntary retirements continue at the same rate as hitherto.

Actuaries' Report. (No. 141A.)

The following cadre would fulfil the above requirements :—

Lieutenant-colonels -	110
Majors - -	143
Captains - -	198
Subalterns - -	361
	812

The present numbers are :—

Lieutenant-colonels -	104
Majors - -	154
Captains - -	186
Subalterns - -	368
	812

Denham Robinson.
Robert Davey.

APPENDIX T.

General Officers of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers.

Question for the War Office Actuaries.

What additions should be made to the present establishments of general officers of the Ordnance Corps to restore the proportions which they bore to the officers serving in those corps when originally fixed in 1854?

Actuaries' Report. (No. 126.)

1. The Royal Warrant of November 1854 gave—
32 general officers of Artillery for 660* officers.
16 „ „ Engineers 329* „

These numbers were based upon the full-pay officers in the several arms below the rank of general officer.
The proportion was in each case about 1 in 21.

2. Between 1854 and 1876, the numbers of full-pay officers have thus changed :—
Artillery from 660* to 1,393†
Engineers „ 329* to 850†

3. As regards general officers, minor changes and amalgamation with the Indian army have, during the same period, brought the numbers to the following :—

		Full-pay Officers including *Supernumeraries.*
Artillery :—		
British, 32 / Indian, 26	58	for 1,393, or 1 in 24
Engineers :—		
British, 18 / Indian, 16	34	for 850, or 1 in 25

* From Report of Royal Commission of 1854.
† This increase is partly accounted for by the Indian amalgamation.

4. If the Artillery and Engineers had for their present numbers of officers on full pay the same proportion of general officers as was awarded by the warrant of 1854, assuming that any augmentation of general officers would be met by a corresponding reduction of colonels, the numbers would stand :—

Artillery, 67 instead of 58; *i.e.* increase, 9.
Engineers, 41 instead of 34; *i.e.* increase, 7.

5. If the additions shown in 4 were made the following would be the manner in which the total should be divided (pending ultimate amalgamation) between the British and Indian lists.

—	British.	Indian.	Total.
Increased Establishment :—			
Artillery - - -	42	25	67
Engineers - - -	23	18	41
Existing Establishment :—			
Artillery - - -	32	26	58
Engineers - - -	18	16	34

Denham Robinson.
Robert Davey.

1st March 1876.

APPENDIX U.

Memorandum on Officers reported upon unfavourably in Confidential Reports.

The number of officers who have been unfavourably reported upon since the institution of the present form of Confidential Report in April 1873, is as follows :—

1st. Officers reported unfit for promotion,
8 majors.
17 captains.
20 lieutenants.
3 sub-lieutenants.
48

In the above cases the following results have taken place :—

Majors: 2 majors retired by sale.
1 major „ to half-pay.
1 „ about to retire.

Captains: 4 captains retired by sale.
1 captain placed on permanent half-pay.
1 „ to be finally considered on next report.
1 „ later reports have been more favourable owing to this officer having striven to remedy the defects complained of.

Lieutenants—7 have retired.

2nd. Officers who have been badly reported upon but not expressly said to be unfit for promotion, and whose cases will be decided as further reports are received.
2 lieutenant-colonels.
4 captains and lieutenant-colonels.
15 majors.
54 captains.
53 lieutenants.
9 sub-lieutenants.
6 quartermasters.
143

With the following results, at present :—
1 lieutenant-colonel about to resign his command.
1 captain and lieutenant-colonel retired.
1 major retired.
7 captains retired.
8 lieutenants retired.
1 lieutenant still under consideration.
1 „ to temporary half-pay on account of health.
1 „ dead.
2 sub-lieutenants resigned.
2 quartermasters retired to half-pay.
1 quartermaster to go on completion of service.
1 „ dead.

APP. U.

3rd. Officers considered unfit for responsible command, but in consequence of previous good service were promoted, and at once retired.

3 majors to lieutenant-colonels, all retired.
2 captains to majors, all retired.

4th. Officers who had been badly reported upon, but who, in consequence of improved character, have since been promoted.

3 captains to major.
1 badly reported upon since promotion, and ordered to retire.
3 lieutenants to captains.
1 badly reported upon since promotion, and ordered to retire.

5th. Officers passed over for promotion.

1 major.
1 captain.
3 lieutenants.

15th February 1875.

R. B. HAWLEY, A.M.S.

APPENDIX V.

APP.

NORMAL COST AND EFFECTS OF THE SCHEME PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION, COMPARED WITH THE COST AND EFFECTS WHICH WOULD RESULT FROM THE EXISTING REGULATIONS.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY.

The following calculations show what will be the probable cost and effect of the proposal of the Royal Commissions when the scheme has come into full operation. Compared with the probable cost and effect to be expected from the Retirement Regulations now in force, supposing the present inducements for officers to retire by the sale of their commission to have ceased to exist, as shown in Appendix E., the result may be shortly stated as follows:—

Supposing the scheme of the Commission to work in the Ordnance Corps at its slowest rate, and in the other branches of the service at a "mean rate," that is to say, at a rate as nearly as may be half-way between the quickest and slowest rates at which they might possibly act,—the assumptions which, judging from the experience of the past, are, perhaps, most probable,—the following promotion would be secured.

Officers would obtain the several ranks after serving, in all, for the periods stated below:—

	Household Cavalry.		Cavalry of Line.		Foot Guards.		Infantry.		Artillery.		Engineers.	
	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.	Under the Proposed System.	Under the Present System.
Captain	8½	16⅓	8½	17⅓	9	19	8	15¾	12	14½	12½	14
Major	14	29⅓	14	29¾	14	31	14	29¼	20	24	20	23½
Lieutenant-colonel	18¾	32¾	20	33¼	22¾	34½	23	33½	27	32½	26	32
Major-general	31	50	32	50¾	35	50¾	35	50¾	41	45	40	44
Honorary colonel	48	53½	46	54	49	57	48	56	55	52	54½	51

The ultimate non-effective charge on the estimates for all arms under the two schemes, supposing none of the pensions granted to be commuted, would be as follows:—

Under the proposed scheme - 1,346,220*l.* a year.
Under the present rules - 962,200*l.* a year.

Supposing all non-effective pay to be commuted,—and it is on this supposition that the fairest comparison can be obtained, as the schemes would come into operation in many of their details at varying distances of time, and would probably reach their maximum cost in the one case much more quickly than in the other,—the cost would be as follows:—

Under the proposed scheme - 889,184*l.* a year.
Under the present rules - 475,977*l.* a year.

The normal charge for "non-effectives" under the scheme proposed will thus exceed the cost which would be increased for "non-effectives" under existing rules by 384,020*l.* a year, assuming no pensions to be commuted, or by 413,207*l.* a year, assuming all pensions to be commuted.

On the other hand by the rearrangements proposed in the Ordnance Corps a reduction of 52,274*l.* will be made in the cost of the effective list.

It thus appears that by the introduction of the scheme proposed by the Commissioners the following acceleration of promotion would be obtained at a cost (assuming no pensions to be commuted) of 331,746*l.*, a year, or (assuming all non-effective pay to be commuted) at a cost of 360,933*l.* a year. Some parts of these amounts would be repaid by the Indian Government.

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.	Royal Artillery.	Royal Engineers.
Younger age on becoming—	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.
captain	8	9	10	8¾	2¾	1¾
major	15⅓	15⅝	17	15¼	4	3¾
lieutenant-colonel	13⅔	13½	11⅓	10⅓	5¼	6
major-general	19	18¾	15¾	15¾	4	4

20th July 1876.

T. D. PIGOTT, Secretary.

PART I.

Guards and Line.

Report on the Cost and Effect of the Proposals of the Royal Commission, so far as they relate to the Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line. [Normal.]

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ACTUARIES.

Calculate for Guards and Line the costs and effects of the following scheme:—

(*a.*) Producing the most rapid promotion. (*b.*) Producing the slowest promotion. (*c.*) Working at a mean of (*a*) and (*b*).

SUBALTERNS AND CAPTAINS.

1. That no retirement be given until an officer has completed eight years' service in the army.
2. That, on completion of eight years' service, an officer, if allowed to retire, be granted a lump sum, as follows:—

After 8 years' service	-	-	£745
9	„	„	873
10	„	„	995
11	„	„	1,133
12	„	„	1,269
13	„	„	1,401
After 14 years' service	-	-	1,543
15	„	„	1,698
16	„	„	1,862
17	„	„	2,021
18	„	„	2,178
19	„	„	2,357

3. That a captain, on completion of 20 years' total service, if not promoted, be compulsory retired on 200*l.* a year.

QUESTIONS FOR ACTUARIES—*continued.*

MAJORS.

4. That a major, if allowed to retire before completing a total service of 23 years, be granted a lump sum as in §2.

5. That a major, if retiring after completing 23 years' total service, be granted a pension of 250*l.* a year.

6. That a major, on completion of seven years' service as substantive major, and not less than 27 years' total service, be compulsory retired from the regiment, if not promoted, with choice of the following alternatives :—

(*p.*) A pension of 300*l.* a year, with a step of honorary rank.

(*q.*) Unattached promotion, with chance of employment other than regimental.

LIEUTENANT COLONELS AND BREVET COLONELS.

7. That lieutenant-colonels, if allowed to retire within five years of the date of their promotion to the rank, but not less than 27 years' service be granted the choice of the following alternatives :—

(*r.*) A retired pension of 300*l.* a year, with a step of honorary rank.

(*s.*) Half-pay, with the chance of employment other than regimental.

(*t.*) On completing 30 years' total service, the present full-pay retirement of 1*l.* a day.

8. Lieutenant-colonels if allowed to retire with less than 27 years' total service, to have the same as majors retiring voluntarily.

BREVET COLONELS.

9. That brevet colonels, on completion of five years' service as lieutenant-colonels with their regiments, or on the staff, be compulsory retired from their regiments with choice of the following alternatives :—

(*u.*) A pension of 420*l.*, with prospective honorary rank of major-general and permanent retirement from the army, in addition to any good service pension.

(*w.*) Half-pay, with the chance of staff employment, and succession to the establishment of general officers.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

10. An establishment of 275 effective general officers to be maintained.

11. General officers to be removed to a Retired List at the age of 70.

STAFF OFFICERS.

12. All officers appointed to the staff to be seconded.

13. All officers seconded for service on the staff to rejoin their regiments on completion of their staff service with the following exceptions :

14. Captains who have completed 20 years' service to be compulsory retired on completion of their staff service, on the same terms as regimental captains.

15. Majors who have held the substantive rank of major for seven years to be compulsory retired on completion of their staff service, on the same terms as regimental majors.

16. All captains and majors appointed to the staff, to be allowed to complete their five years' tenure of staff employment without reference to their length of service.

17. Lieutenant-colonels on appointment to the staff to be struck off their regiments, and not to return.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No 112.)

1. The total number of officers in the several ranks for whom retirement will have to be calculated under our instructions are :—

—	Household Cavalry.			Cavalry of the Line.			Foot Guards.			Infantry.*		
	Regimental.	Extra Regimental.	Total.	Regimental.	Extra Regimental.	Total.	Regimental.	Extra Regimental.	Total.	Regimental.	Extra Regimental.	Total.
Lieutenant-colonels	3	1	4	28	17	45	3	2	5	150	100	250
Majors	3	—	3	34	2	36	7	—	7	296	41	337
Captains	24	—	24	222	13	235	71	3	74	1,492	66	1,558
Subalterns	39	—	39	405	7	412	147	5	152	2,645	27	2,672
	69	1	70	689	39	728	228	10	238	4,583	234	4,817

* The term "Infantry," in this Report signifies "Infantry of the Line and West India Regiments."

Of the infantry subalterns we estimate that the promotion and retirement for 388 will be provided by the Indian Staff Corps.

It is to be observed that these numbers do not exactly agree with existing numbers; but they are those furnished to the Royal Commission by the Accountant General, and we have adhered to them as allowing best of comparison with the calculations in our report on the present system (Actuaries' Report, No. 99).

App E.

2. In the tables appended we show, in three columns, the cost of the scheme of retirement placed before us by the Royal Commission :—

Column (*a.*) shows the effect if officers should be so eager to retire that after eight years' service they only leave sufficient to fill vacancies in the rank of major.

This is an extreme assumption and shows what may be considered the *maximum of promotion.*

Column (*b.*) assumes that officers will not retire until the regulations force them out; or it is their clear interest to retire.

This represents the *slowest promotion* which can take place.

Column (*c.*) represents the cost and effect on retirement (so far as the conditions permit) of the scheme working with promotion at a mean rate between that attained in (*a.*) and that reached in (*b.*).

3. On line 60 of the table we show the annual cost, under each supposition, on the basis that all non-effective pay is commuted. This goes, however, somewhat beyond the provisions of the Commutation Act, under which only those pensions which are final retirements can be commuted; but it is the only way in which schemes which come into operation at varying distances of time and reach their maximum cost with varying rapidity can be brought to a common basis; and thus it forms a fairer comparison of real cost than can be shown by the amounts for annual pensions which would be borne upon the estimates. How strongly this is the case will be seen in the table appended, where the slow promotion (*b.*) costs on the estimates :

—	Total Non-effective cost.	Additional Effective cost.	Total.
	£	£	£
Household Cavalry	20,405	—	20,405
Cavalry	178,152	5,494	183,646
Foot Guards	59,877	1,518	61,395
Infantry	1,023,560	29,127	1,052,687
Total	1,281,994	36,139	1,318,133

against only for quick promotion (*a.*)—

—	Total Non-effective.	Additional Effective.	Total.
	£	£	£
Household Cavalry	15,553	—	15,553
Cavalry	128,827	5,494	134,321
Foot Guards	29,893	1,518	31,411
Infantry	659,120	29,127	688,247
Total	833,393	36,139	869,532

while when reduced to a commutation value the cost of the quick promotion (*a.*) is—

APP. V.

	Total Non-effective.	Additional Effective.	Total.
	£	£	£
Household Cavalry -	8,754	—	8,754
Cavalry - - -	83,980	5,494	89,474
Foot Guards - -	23,367	1,518	24,885
Infantry - -	470,300	29,127	499,427
Total - -	586,401	36,139	622,540

nearly equalling that of the slow promotion (*b.*) which is as follows:

	Total Non-effective.	Additional Effective.	Total.
	£	£	£
Household Cavalry -	9,237	—	9,237
Cavalry - - -	85,380	5,494	90,874
Foot Guards - -	27,400	1,518	28,918
Infantry - -	500,050	29,127	529,177
Total - -	622,067	36,139	658,206

Had the lump sum allowed to officers of less than 20 years' service been so calculated as to be equal in cost to the public to the annuities granted after that service, the cost of the rapid and of the slow promotion would be identical.

4. We have not allowed for any resignations by officers of less than eight years' service. The fact that a retirement can be had, at will, after eight years' service will naturally bring to a minimum voluntary resignations without money compensation.

5. Taking the mean action as shown in column (*c.*) to represent an approximation to the actual normal operation of the scheme, we have the following comparison between the promotion which would be given with that which the system now existing will give (Actuaries' Report, No. 99, § 10), and with that which obtained under Purchase (Report, No. 73, § 2).

App. E.
App. C.

TOTAL SERVICE IN YEARS ON ATTAINING RANK.

	Household Cavalry.			Cavalry of Line.		
	Proposed System (mean).	Present System.	Purchase.	Proposed System (mean).	Present System.	Purchase.
Subaltern -	0	0	0	0	0	0
Captain -	8½	16½	7	8½	17½	7⅓
Major - -	14	29¼	19½	14	29¾	15¾
Lieutenant-colonel	19	32¾	24¾	20	33¼	20¼
Major-general -	31	50		32	50¾	
Honorary colonel	48	53⅓		46	54	

	Foot Guards.			Infantry.		
	Proposed System (mean).	Present System.	Purchase.	Proposed System (mean).	Present System.	Purchase.
Subaltern -	0	0		0	0	0
Captain - -	9	19		8	15¾	9
Major - -	14	31		14	29¼	19
Lieutenant-colonel	23	34½		23	33½	23½
Major-General -	35	50¾		35	50¾	
Honorary colonel	49	57		48	56	

6. The cost to the public would be on the annual estimates—

(MEAN ACTION.)

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£
For Non-effective - -	15,193	122,123	31,728	662,750	831,794
For Effective, caused by seconding officers now borne on the strength of regiments - - -	—	5,494	1,518	29,127	36,139
Total - - -	15,193	127,617	33,246	691,877	867,933

This compares, as regards the present system (see Actuaries' Report 99, § 12), with the following charge: App. E.

Household Cavalry -	£11,483
Cavalry of Line - -	87,993
Foot Guards - -	28,530
Infantry - - -	501,060
	£629,066

Showing that the following acceleration of promotion would cost 238,867*l.*, on the annual estimates:—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
Younger age on becoming captain -	8	9	10	8¾
„ major - - -	15¼	15¾	17	15½
„ lieutentant-colonel -	13¾	13½	11½	10½
„ major-general -	19	18¾	15¾	15¾
„ honorary colonel -	5¼	8	8	8

7. If all non-effective payments be commuted, the cost of the new scheme will stand at—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£
For Non-effective - -	9,266	84,694	25,480	483,715	603,155
For Effective, caused by seconding officers now borne on the strength of regiments -	—	5,494	1,518	29,127	36,139
Total -	9,266	90,188	26,998	512,842	639,294

as compared with the present system:—

Household Cavalry - -	£4,702
Cavalry - - - -	40,019
Foot Guards - - -	12,601
Infantry - - - -	227,215
	£284,537

showing an additional charge for the accelerated promotion in § 6 of 354,757*l.* This, as explained in § 3, is the nearer measure of the increased charge.

8. The value to the officer shows as follows for the infantry:—

	Infantry.	
	Proposed System.	Present System.
Present Value of future prospects:—	£	£
On entering at 20 years of age - - -	2,456	2,717
When he shall have completed 10 year's service	2,520	3,789
„ „ 20 „ -	5,508	3,198
„ „ 30 „ -	5,792	3,671
„ „ 40 „ -	6,570	4,352
Annuity for remainder of life equivalent to above Values:—		
From age 20 - - - - -	141	156
„ 30 - - - - -	152	199
„ 40 - - - - -	370	215
„ 50 - - - - -	462	292
„ 60 - - - - -	674	447

9. The proportionately large retirement from the Foot Guards below the rank of field officer is attributable to the very small establishment of regimental field officers at present accorded to those corps.

10. It is to be observed that, throughout this calculation, we have assumed that the lieutenant-colonels who serve extra-regimentally for five years will have previously served their full five years as regimental lieutenant-colonels. Were they posted to extra-regimental offices before completing five years with regiments the following modifications would occur:—

(*a.*) Less officers would retire as majors or as captains, but more as lieutenant-colonels.

(*b.*) The rank of major-general and the pay of honorary colonel would be obtained somewhat earlier.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
1st July 1876. ROBERT DAVEY.

TABLES APPENDED.

Household Cavalry.

	(*a.*) Quick Promotion.	(*b.*) Slow Promotion.	(*c.*) Mean Rate of Promotion.
AGE ON ATTAINING THE SEVERAL RANKS.			
1. Subaltern - - years	20	20	20
2. Captains - - „	25	32	28½
3. Major - - „	28	40	34
4. Lieutenant-colonel - „	33	44½	38¾
5. Major-general - „	46	56	51
6. Honorary colonel - „	67	69½	68
SERVICE IN EACH REGIMENTAL RANK.			
7. Service as subaltern - years	5	12	8½
8. „ captain - „	3	8	5½
9. „ major - „	5	4½	4¾
10. „ lieutenant-colonel in regiment - „	5	5	5
„ on staff, &c. - „	5	5	5
Subalterns.			
11. Entering at age 20 - number	8·2	3·5	4·8
12. Joining Indian staff corps - „	—	—	—
13. Resigning without compensation - „	—	—	—
14. Retiring on a lump sum - „	—	—	—
15. Promoted to be captains - „	7·8	3·1	4·4
Captains.			
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service - „	6·9	—	3·6
17. Retiring, compulsorily, on 200*l.* a year - „	—	2·1	—
18. Promoted to be majors - „	·6	·7	·6
Majors.			
19. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 23 years' service - „	—	—	—
20. Retiring voluntarily on 250*l.* a year - „	—	—	—
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - „	—	—	—
22. Withdrawing compulsorily, with unattached promotion to lieutenant-colonels - „	—	—	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonels - „	·6	·6	·6
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.			
24. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - „	—	—	
25. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment on half pay, with chance of employment - „	—	—	—
26. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on retired full pay of 365*l.* - „	—	—	—
27. On completing 5 years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 420*l.* - „	—	—	—
28. On completing 5 years with regiment, passing to half pay or staff employment - „	·6	·6	·6
29. Retiring on 420*l.* a year after service on staff, &c. - „	—	—	—
30. Promoted to be major-general - „	·5	·5	·5

(*Continued.*)

APP. V.

Household Cavalry—cont.

Household Cavalry—*cont.*

	(*a.*) Quick Promotion.	(*b.*) Slow Promotion.	(*c.*) Mean Rate of Promotion
Number of Officers Non-Effective.			
31. General officers:—honorary colonels { over 70	2·3	2·8	2·5
under 70	·7	·2	·5
32. „ „ unattached	8·9	5·7	7·8
Fixed List and Retired	11·9	8·7	10·8
33. Retired as colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 27) number	—	—	—
34. Colonels on half pay (line 28) „	4·3	3·6	3·9
35. Lieutenant-colonels retired on 365*l.* (line 26) „	—	—	—
36. „ on half-pay (line 25) „	—	—	—
37. „ retired on 300*l.* a year (line 24) „	—	—	—
38. „ on half-pay, promoted from majors (line 22) „	—	—	—
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) „	—	—	—
40. „ 250*l.* „ (line 20) „	—	—	—
41. Survivors of majors who retired on lump sums (line 19) „	—	—	—
42. Captains retired on 200*l.* a year (line 17) „	—	57	—
43. Survivors of captains who retired on lump sums (line 16) „	337	—	111
44. Survivors of subalterns who retired on lump sums(line 14) „	—	—	—
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) „	353	70	126
46. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective officers „	503	99	177
Annual Charge for Non-effective.	£	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31)	5,400	5,400	5,400
48. Unattached general officers (line 32)	4,061	2,693	3,359
49. Retired officers, colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 33)	—	—	—
50. „ lieutenant-colonels on 365*l.* a year (line 35)	—	—	—
51. „ lieutenant-colonels on 300*l.* a year (line 37)	—	—	—
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39)	—	—	—
53. „ „ 250*l.* „ (line 40)	—	—	
54. „ „ lump sums (line 41)	—	—	
55. „ captains on 200*l.* a year (line 42)	—	11,490	—
56. „ „ lump sums (line 43)	5,111	—	5,554
57. „ subalterns on lump sums (line 44)	—	—	—
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (lines 34, 36, 38)	981	822	880
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective	15,553	20,405	15,193
60. Total annual charge for non-effective, if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.]	8,754	9,237	9,266
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer:—			
On line 59	222	296	220
On line 60	125	134	134

Cavalry of Line.

Cavalry of the Line.

Age on attaining the several Ranks.			
1. Subaltern years	20	20	20
2. Captain „	25	32	28½
3. Major „	28	40	34
4. Lieutenant-colonel „	34	46	40
5. Major-general „	47	57⅓	52
6. Honorary colonel „	63	69½	66
Service in each Regimental Rank.			
7. Service as subaltern years	5	12	8½
8. „ captain „	3	8	5½
9. „ major „	6	6	6
10. „ lieutenant- colonel, regimental „	5	5	5
„ „ staff, &c. „	5	5	5
Subalterns.			
11. Entering at age 20 number	84	36	51
12. Joining Indian staff corps „	—	—	—
13. Resigning without compensation „	—	—	—
14. Retiring on a lump sum „	—	—	2
15. Promoted to be captains „	80	31	44
Captains.			
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service „	71	—	35
17. Retiring, compulsorily, on 200*l.* a year „	—	22	—
18. Promoted to be majors „	6	6	6
Majors.			
19. Retiring voluntarily on lump sums, under 23 years' service „	—	—	—
20. Retiring voluntarily on 250*l.* a year „	—	—	—
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) „	—	—	—
22. Withdrawing compulsorily, with unattached promotion to lieutenant-colonels „	—	—	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonel „	6	6	6

(*Continued.*)

Cavalry of the Line—*cont.*

APP. V.

Cavalry of Line—cont.

	(a.) Quick Promotion.	(b.) Slow Promotion.	(c.) Mean Rate of Promotion.
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.			
24. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - number	—	—	—
25. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on half-pay, with chance of employment - „	—	—	—
26. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on retired full pay of 365*l.* - „	—	—	—
27. On completing five years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 420*l.* „	2	—	1
28. On completing five years with regiment, passing to half-pay or staff employment - „	4	5	4
29. Retiring on 420*l.* a year, after service on staff, &c. - „	—	—	—
30. Promoted to be major-general - „	3	5	4
NUMBER OF OFFICERS NON-EFFECTIVE.			
31. General officers:—honorary colonels { over 70 - number	15	26	18
{ under 70 „	13	2	10
32. „ „ unattached - „	43	46	42
Fixed List and Retired -	71	74	70
33. Retired as colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 27) - „	53	—	32
34. Colonels on half-pay (line 28) - „	28	33	27
35. Lieutenant-colonels retired on 365*l.* (line 26) - „	—	—	—
36. „ on half-pay (line 25) - „	—	—	—
37. „ retired on 300*l.* a year (line 24) - „	—	—	—
38. „ on half-pay, promoted from majors (line 22) - „	—	—	—
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) - „	—	—	—
40. „ 250*l.* „ (line 20) - „	—	—	—
41. Survivors of majors who retired on lump sums (line 19) - „	—	—	—
42. Captains retired on 200*l.* a year (line 17) - „	—	608	—
43. Survivors of captains who retired on lump sums (line 16) - „	2,445	—	1,083
44. Survivors of subalterns who retired on lump sums (line 14) - „	—	—	60
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) - „	2,597	715	1,272
46. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective officers - „	354	96	173
ANNUAL CHARGE FOR NON-EFFECTIVE.	£	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31) -	28,000	28,000	28,000
48. Unattached general officers (line 32) -	19,540	21,170	19,270
49. Retired officers, colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 33) -	22,250	—	13,230
50. „ lieutenant-colonels on 365*l.* a year (line 35) -	—	—	—
51. „ „ on 300*l.* „ (line 37) -	—	—	—
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39) -	—	—	—
53. „ „ 250*l.* „ (line 40) -	—	—	—
54. „ „ lump sums (line 41) -	—	—	—
55. „ captains on 200*l.* a year (line 42) -	—	121,500	—
56. „ „ lump sums (line 43) -	52,660	—	54,140
57. „ subalterns on lump sums (line 44) -	—	—	1,304
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (lines 34, 36, 38) -	6,377	7,482	6,179
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective -	128,827	178,152	122,123
60. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.] -	83,980	85,380	84,694
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer :—			
On line 59 -	181	251	172
On line 60 -	118	120	119

Foot Guards.

Foot Guards.

AGE ON ATTAINING THE SEVERAL RANKS.			
1. Subaltern - years	20	20	20
2. Captain - „	25	33	29
3. Major - „	28	40	34
4. Lieutenant-colonel - „	38½	47	42¾
5. Major-general - „	51½	58½	55
6. Honorary colonel - „	68	70	69
SERVICE IN EACH REGIMENTAL RANK.			
7. Service as subaltern - years	5	13	9
8. „ captain - „	3	7	5
9. „ major - „	10½	7	8¾
10. „ lieutenant-colonel, regimental - „	5	5	5
„ „ staff, &c. - „	5	5	5
Subalterns.			
11. Entering at age 20 - number	29	13	18
12. Joining Indian staff corps - „	—	—	—
13. Resigning without compensation - „	—	—	—
14. Retiring on a lump sum - „	—	—	1
15. Promoted to be captains - „	28	11	16

(*Continued.*)

APP. V.

Foot Guards —cont.

Foot Guards—*cont.*

	(*a.*) Quick Promotion.	(*b.*) Slow Promotion.	(*c.*) Mean Rate of Promotion.
Captains.			
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service - - number	26	—	14
17. Retiring, compulsorily, on 200*l.* a year - - - - - - „	—	9	—
18. Promoted to be majors - - - - - - - - „	·7	1	·8
Majors.			
19. Retiring voluntarily on lump sums, under 23 years' service - - - „	—	—	—
20. Retiring voluntarily on 250*l.* a year - - - - - - „	—	—	·1
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - - „	—	·3	—
22. Withdrawing compulsorily, with unattached promotion to lieutenant-colonels - - - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonels - - - - - „	·6	·6	·6
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.			
24. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
25. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on half-pay, with chance of employment - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
26. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on retired full pay of 365*l.* - - - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
27. On completing 5 years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 420*l.* - „	—	—	—
28. On completing 5 years with regiment, passing to half-pay or staff employment - - - - - - - - „	·6	·6	·6
29. Retiring on 420*l.* a year after service on staff, &c. - - - - „	—	—	—
30. Promoted to be major-general - - - - - - - „	·5	·5	·5
NUMBER OF OFFICERS NON-EFFECTIVE.			
31. General officers: honorary colonels { over 70 - - - number under 70 - - - „	2·6 ·4	3· —	2·7 ·3
32. „ unattached - - - - - - - „	7·2	4·7	5·9
Fixed List and Retired - - - - - -	10·2	7·7	8·9
33. Retired as colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 27) - - - - - „	—	—	—
34. Colonels on half-pay (line 28) - - - - - - - „	4·5	3·5	3·8
35. Lieutenant-colonels retired on 365*l.* (line 26) - - - - - „	—	—	—
36. „ on half-pay (line 25) - - - - - „	—	—	—
37. „ retired on 300*l.* a year (line 24) - - - - „	—	—	—
38. Lieutenant-colonels on half-pay, promoted from majors (line 22) - „	—	—	—
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) - - - - - - „	—	7·4	—
40. „ 250*l.* „ (line 20) - - - - - - „	—	—	2·8
41. Survivors of majors who retired on lump sums (line 19) - - „	—	—	—
42. Captains retired on 200*l.* a year (line 17) - - - - - „	—	243	—
43. Survivors of captains who retired on lump sums (line 16) - - „	906	—	418
44. Survivors of subalterns who retired on lump sums (line 14) - - „	—	—	21
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) - - - - „	921	262	455
46. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective officers - - - „	386	109	190
ANNUAL CHARGE FOR NON-EFFECTIVE.	£	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31) - - - - - - - -	6,200	6,200	6,200
48. Unattached general officers (line 32) - - - - - - -	3,286	2,122	2,670
49. Retired officers, colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 33) - - - -	—	—	—
50. „ lieutenant-colonels on 365*l.* a year (line 35) - - -	—	—	—
51. „ „ on 300*l.* a year (line 37) - - -	—	—	—
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39) - - - - -	—	2,230	—
53. „ „ 250*l.* a year (line 40) - - - - -	—	—	691
54. „ „ lump sums (line 41) - - - - -	—	—	—
55. „ captains on 200*l.* a year (line 42) - - - -	—	48,620	—
56. „ „ lump sums (line 43) - - - - -	19,510	—	20,850
57. „ subalterns on lump sums (line 44) - - - -	—	—	550
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (lines 34, 36, 38) - - -	897	705	767
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective - - - -	29,893	59,877	31,728
60. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.] - - - - - - - - -	23,367	27,400	25,480
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer:—			
On line 59 - - - - - - - - -	127	254	135
On line 60 - - - - - - - - -	99	116	108

Infantry of Line.

Infantry.

AGE ON ATTAINING THE SEVERAL RANKS.			
1. Subaltern - - - - - - - - years	20	20	20
2. Captain - - - - - - - - - - „	24½	31⅓	28
3. Major - - - - - - - - - - „	28	40	34
4. Lieutenant-colonel - - - - - - - „	38½	47	43
5. Major-general - - - - - - - - „	51½	58½	55
6. Honorary colonel - - - - - - - - „	64½	71	68

(*Continued.*)

Infantry—*cont.*

	(*a.*) Quick Promotion.	(*b.*) Slow Promotion.	(*c.*) Mean Rate of Promotion.
Service in each Regimental Rank.			
7. Service as subaltern - - - - - - - years	4½	11½	8
8. „ captain - - - - - - - „	3½	8½	6
9. „ major - - - - - - - „	10½	7	9
10. „ lieutenant-colonel, regimental - - - - „	5	5	5
„ „ on staff, &c. - - - - „	7	5	5
Subalterns.			
11. Entering at age 20 - - - - - - number	599	314	396
12. Joining Indian staff corps - - - - - - „	95	95	95
13. Resigning without compensation - - - - - „	—	—	—
14. Retiring on a lump sum - - - - - - „	—	—	1
15. Promoted to be captains - - - - - - - „	478	187	270
Captains.			
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service - - „	422	—	211
17. Retiring, compulsorily, on 200*l.* a year - - - - - „	—	120	—
18. Promoted to be majors - - - - - - - „	35	51	39
Majors.			
19. Retiring voluntarily on lump sums, under 23 years' service - - „	—	—	—
20. Retiring voluntarily on 250*l.* a year - - - - - „	—	—	4
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - - „	—	15	—
22. Withdrawing compulsorily, with unattached promotion to lieutenant-colonels - - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonels - - - - „	31	31	31
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.			
24. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
25. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on half pay, with chance of employment - - - - - - „	—	—	—
26. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on retired full pay of 365*l.* - - - - - - - - „	—	—	—
27. On completing 5 years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 420*l.* - „	13	3	9
28. On completing 5 years with regiment, passing to half-pay or staff employment - - - - - - - - „	16	26	20
29. Retiring, on 420*l.* a year, after staff employment, &c. - - - „	—	—	—
30. Promoted to be major-general - - - - - - „	14	23	17
Number of Officers Non-Effective.			
31. General officers:—honorary colonels { over 70 - - - number	68	114	91
{ under 70 - - - „	46	—	23
32. „ „ unattached { over 70 - - - „	—	16	—
{ under 70 - - - „	155	216	186
Fixed List and Retired - - - - - -	269	346	300
33. Retired as colonels on 420*l.* a year - - - - - „	323	52	204
34. Colonels on half-pay (line 28) - - - - - „	118	159	130
35. Lieutenant-colonels retired on 365*l.* (line 26) - - - - „	—	—	—
36. „ on half-pay (line 25) - - - - „	—	—	—
37. „ retired on 300*l.* a year (line 24) - - - „	—	—	—
38. „ on half-pay, promoted from majors (line 22) - - „	—	—	—
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) - - - - „	—	333	—
40. „ 250*l.* „ (line 20) - - - - „	—	—	106
41. Survivors of majors who retired on lump sums (line 19) - - „	—	—	—
42. Captains retired on 200*l.* a year (line 17) - - - - „	—	3,247	—
43. Survivors of captains who retired on lump sums (line 16) - - „	14,600	—	7,281
44. Survivors of subalterns who retired on lump sums (line 14) - - „	—	—	35
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) - - - „	15,310	4,137	7,281
46. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective officers - - - „	329	88	156
Annual Charge for Non-effective.	£	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31) - - - - - - -	114,000	114,000	114,000
48. Unattached general officers (line 32) - - - - - -	70,730	106,280	84,920
49. Retired officers, colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 33) - - - -	135,600	21,990	85,510
50. „ lieutenant-colonels on 365*l.* a year (line 33) - - -	—	—	—
51. „ lieutenant-colonels on 300*l.* „ (line 37) - - -	—	—	—
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39) - - - -	—	99,980	—
53. „ „ 250*l.* „ (line 40) - - - -	—	—	26,575
54. „ „ lump sums (line 41) - - - -	—	—	—
55. „ captains on 200*l.* a year (line 42) - - - -	—	649,400	—
56. „ „ lump sums (line 43) - - - -	315,100	—	325,000
57. „ subalterns on lump sums (line 44) - - - -	—	—	745
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (lines 34, 36, 38) - -	23,690	31,990	26,000
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective - - - -	659,120	1,023,560	662,750
60. „ for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.]	470,300	500,050	483,715
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer:			
On line 59 - - - - - - - - -	140	217	141
On line 60 - - - - - - - - -	100	106	103

APP. V.

Recapitulation.

Guards and Line.

RECAPITULATION.

On the Mean Rate of Promotion (*c.*)

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.
Age on attaining the several Ranks.				
1. Subaltern — years	20	20	20	20
2. Captain — „	28½	28½	29	28
3. Major — „	34	34	34	34
4. Lieutenant-colonel — „	38¾	40	42¾	43
5. Major-general — „	51	52	55	55
6. Honorary colonel — „	68	66	69	68
Service in each Regimental Rank.				
7. Service as subaltern — years	8⅛	8⅛	8	8
8. „ captain — „	5⅛	5⅛	5	6
9. „ major — „	4¾	6	8¾	9
10. „ lieutenant-colonel, regimental — „	5	5	5	5
„ „ on staff, &c. — „	5	5	5	5
Subalterns.				
11. Entering at age 20 — number	4·8	51	18	396
12. Joining Indian staff corps — „	—	—	—	95
13. Resigning without compensation — „	—	—	—	—
14. Retiring on a lump sum — „	—	2	1	1
15. Promoted to be captains — „	4·4	44	16	270
Captains.				
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service „	3·6	35	14	211
17. Retiring, compulsorily, on 200*l.* a year „	—	—	—	—
18. Promoted to be majors „	·6	6	·8	39
Majors.				
19. Retiring voluntarily on lump sums, under 23 years' service „	—	—	—	—
20. Retiring voluntarily on 250*l.* a year „	—	—	·1	4
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) „	—	—	—	—
22. Withdrawing compulsorily, with unattached promotion to lieutenant-colonels „	—	—	—	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonels „	·6	6	·6	31
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.				
24. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) „	—	—	—	—
25. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment on half pay, with chance of employment „	—	—	—	—
26. Retiring voluntarily, within 5 years of appointment, on retired full pay of 365*l.* „	—	—	—	—
27. On completing 5 years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 420*l.* „	—	·1	—	9
28. On completing 5 years with regiment, passing to half pay or staff employment „	·6	4	·6	20
29. Retiring on 420*l.* a year, after staff service, &c. „	—	—	—	—
30. Promoted to be major-general „	·5	4	·5	17
Number of Officers Non-Effective.				
31. General officers:—honorary colonels { over 70 — number	2·5	18	2·7	91
{ under 70 „	·5	10	·3	23
32. „ „ unattached „	7·8	42	5·9	186
Fixed list and retired „	10·8	70	8·9	300
33. Retired as colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 27) „	—	32	—	204
34. Colonels on half pay (line 28) (excluding those on staff) „	3·9	27	3·8	130
35. Lieutenant-colonels retired on 365*l.* (line 26) „	—	—	—	—
36. „ „ on half-pay (line 25) „	—	—	—	—
37. „ „ retired on 300*l.* a year (line 24) „	—	—	—	—
38. „ „ on half-pay, promoted from majors (line 22) „	—	—	—	—
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) „	—	—	—	—
40. „ 250*l.* „ (line 20) „	—	—	2·8	106
41. Survivors of majors who retire on lump sums (line 19) „	—	—	—	—
42. Captains retired on 200*l.* a year (line 17) „	—	—	—	—
43. Survivors of captains who retired on lump sums (line 16) „	111	1,083	418	6,506
44. Survivors of subalterns who retired on lump sums (line 14) „	—	60	21	35
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) „	126	1,272	455	7,281
46. Number of non-effectives per 100 effective officers „	177	173	190	156

Recapitulation—*cont.*

APP. V

Recapitulation—cont.

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.
ANNUAL CHARGE FOR NON-EFFECTIVE.	£	£	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31)	5,400	28,000	6,200	114,000
48. Unattached general officers (line 32)	3,359	19,270	2,670	84,920
49. Retired officers, colonels on 420*l.* a year (line 33)	—	13,230	—	85,510
50. „ lieutenant-colonels on 365*l.* a year (line 35)	—	—	—	—
51. „ lieutenant-colonels on 300*l.* a year (line 37)	—	—	—	—
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39)	—	—	—	—
53. „ „ 250*l.* „ (line 40)	—	—	691	26,575
54. „ „ lump sums (line 41)	—	—	—	—
55. „ captains on 200*l.* a year (line 42)	—	—	—	—
56. „ „ lump sums (line 43)	5,554	54,140	20,850	325,000
57. „ subalterns on lump sums (line 44)	—	1,304	550	745
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (lines 34, 36, 38)	880	6,179	767	26,000
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective	15,193	122,123	31,728	662,750
60. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.]	9,266	84,649	25,480	483,715
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer:—				
On line 59	220	172	135	141
On line 60	134	119	108	103

PART II.

Report on the Cost and Effect of the Proposals of the Royal Commission, so far as they relate to the Ordnance Corps. [Normal.]

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ACTUARIES.

Artillery and Engineers.

ROYAL ARTILLERY AND ROYAL ENGINEERS.

Terms proposed:

(*a.*) Optional retirement on various lump sums for officers of from 8 to 20 years' service.

(*b.*) Optional retirement for Majors on 250*l.* after 23 years' service.

(*c.*) Compulsory retirement on 300*l.* a year for Majors of 27 years' service who have been Majors for 7 years (unless they prefer unattached half-pay promotion, with the chance of employment).

(*d.*) Optional retirement for Lieut.-colonels on 300*l.* a year after 27 years' service, but less than 5 years in the rank.

(*e.*) Optional retirement of Lieut.-colonels after 30 years' service on 365*l.* a year.

(*f.*) Tenure as Lieut.-colonel limited to 5 years.

(*g.*) For officers holding on for employment, or to become General Officers, half-pay as Lieut.-colonel.

(*h.*) For those who retire after their 5 years as Lieut.-colonel, or later, 450*l.* a year.

(*i.*) Abolition of the rank of regimental colonel. Appointments now held by colonels to go to lieutenant-colonels on half-pay.

(*k.*) General officers to pass to a retired list at 70 years of age, retaining their right of holding colonel-commandantships.

ROYAL ARTILLERY ONLY.

(*l.*) Active list of general officers to consist of 67.

ROYAL ENGINEERS ONLY.

(*m.*) An establishment of 41 General Officers.

(*n.*) Regimental ranks to be in the following proportion:

Lieutenant-colonels	110
Majors	143
Captains	198
Lieutenants	361
	812

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 140.)

1. The numbers at present on the combined British and Indian Lists, including supernumeraries, are:

	Royal Artillery.	Royal Engineers.
Colonels Commandant	28	17
General Officers unattached	30	17
Colonels	69	38
Lieutenant-colonels	157	104
Majors	259	154
Captains	335	186
Lieutenants	573	368
	1,451	884

2. Under the proposal of the Commissioners these numbers will become—

		Royal Artillery.	Royal Engineers.
Colonels Commandant	over 70	28	17
	under 70	—	—
General officers unattached	over 70	26	12
	under 70	67	41
Lieutenant-colonels		157	110
Majors		259	143
Captains		335	198
Subalterns		573	361
		1,445	882

APP. V.

3. This diminution in numbers is only apparent; for between major-generals and lieutenant-colonels there will be a body of brevet-colonels—

Royal artillery	88
Royal engineers	55
	143

either employed as colonels on the staff, or on half pay awaiting promotion to major-general.

4. Throughout this calculation regarding the scientific corps we have assumed that officers will not accept voluntary retirement, except where such retirement exceeds in value their prospects in the service. *A fortiori* there will be no resignation. We, therefore, show the slowest promotion at all likely to happen. It is not probable, we think, that the promotion would be materially more rapid or the expense very different; but any degree of voluntary retirement would tend to expedite promotion, and, as the inducements offered are nearly "equivalent annuities" the non-effective cost would vary little.

5. The specific results of our calculations are shown in the following table:—

	Royal Artillery.	Royal Engineers.
Age on attaining the several Ranks.		
1. Subaltern — years	20	20
2. Captain — „	32	32½
3. Major — „	40	40
4. Lieutenant-colonel — „	47	46
5. Major-general — „	61	60
6. Honorary colonel — „	75	74½
Service in each Regimental Rank.		
7. Service as subaltern — years	12	12½
8. „ captain — „	8	7½
9. „ major — „	7	6
10. „ lieutenant-colonel, regimental — „	5	5
„ „ on staff, &c. — „	5	5
Subalterns.		
11. Entering at age 20 — number	50	31
15. Promoted to be captains — „	44	27
Captains.		
16. Retiring voluntarily on a lump sum, under 20 years' service — „	—	—
18. Promoted to be majors — „	40	25
Majors.		
21. Retiring compulsorily on 300*l.* a year (absolute retirement) — „	3·7	—
23. Promoted to be regimental lieutenant-colonels — „	32·4	23·
Lieutenant-colonels and Brevet-colonels.		
27. On completing 5 years with regiment, retirement (absolute) on 450*l.* — „	19·8	14·2
28. On completing 5 years with regiment, passing to half pay or staff employment — „	10·6	7·1
29. Retiring on 450*l.* a year, after staff service, &c. — „	—	1·1
30. Promoted to be major-general — „	8·7	4·9
Number of Officers Non-Effective.		
31. General officers:—honorary colonels { over 70 — number	28	17
{ under 70 — „	—	—
32. „ „ unattached { over 70 — „	26	12
{ under 70 — „	67	41
Fixed list and retired — „	121	70
33. Retired as colonels on 450*l.* a year (line 27) — „	380	302
34. Colonels on staff employment and on half-pay (line 28) — „	88	55
39. Majors retired on 300*l.* a year (line 21) — „	84	—
45. Total non-effective (including general officers) — „	673	427
46. Number of non-effective per 100 effective officers — „	51	53
Annual Charge for Non-Effective.	£	£
47. Honorary colonels (line 31)	28,392	16,830
48. Unattached general officers (line 32)	45,430	25,250
49. Retired officers, colonels on 450*l.* a year (line 33)	171,100	135,901
52. „ majors on 300*l.* a year (line 39)	25,074	—
58. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels on half-pay (line 34)	18,690	11,620
59. Total annual charge on estimates for non-effective	288,686	189,601
60. Total annual charge for non-effective if all non-effective pay be commuted [5 per cent.]	151,100	98,790
61. Charge for non-effective per effective officer:—		
On line 59	218	234
On line 60	114	122

6. The present value of an appointment at the age of 20 would be:—

	£
Royal Artillery - - - - -	3,725
Royal Engineers - - - - -	3,578

which values compare with those under the existing system in the normal, viz.:—

	£
Royal Artillery - - - - -	3,702*
Royal Engineers - - - - -	3,496*

The reason why the Artillery shows a higher value than the Engineers is that a portion of the Artillery officers have higher pay as serving in the Royal Horse Artillery; which raises the average pay above that in the Engineers. It is possible, however, that the enhanced cost of serving may render this apparent advantage nugatory. It is also to be observed that throughout our calculations present values are based on pay only. As a consequence, allowances being left out in other arms, we have had to omit "extra pay" from the Engineers. If a portion of the extra pay in the Engineers or of allowances in other corps remains a profit to the officer the present value in the corps concerned would be increased. It follows also in such a case that as allowance or extra pay increases with advanced rank, a re-distribution of ranks giving more officers in the upper ranks might cause increased effective cost in the matter of allowances or extra pay beyond what we have shown.

7. As a comparison of cost with the existing system working under similar conditions in a normal state, *i.e.*, without resignation, we have the following results:—

	Maximum charge on Estimate.		Charge with all Non-effective Pay commuted.	
	Artillery.	Engineers.	Artillery.	Engineers.
	£	£	£	£
Cost of non-effective under existing system.	206,437	126,697	112,400	79,040
Ditto under proposals of Royal Commission.	288,686	189,601	151,100	98,790
Increased charge for non-effective.	82,249	62,904	38,700	19,750
Saving in effective pay -	33,741	18,533	33,741	18,533
Net extra cost of proposals.	48,508	44,371	4,959	1,217

* These values differ somewhat from those shown in our Report No. 99, because in the latter a certain amount of voluntary withdrawal has been assumed, for the sake of comparison with other arms. It would be obviously unfair to use that value in the present case.

App. E. † In the calculation in our Report, No. 99, resignations were taken into account.

23rd June 1876.

8. The acceleration of promotion obtained by the expenditure in § 7 is as follows:—

	Artillery.		Engineers.	
	Earlier.	Later.	Earlier.	Later.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
Rank of Captain - -	2½	—	1½	—
„ Major - -	4	—	3½	—
„ Lieutenant-Colonel -	5½	—	6	—
„ Major-General -	4	—	4	—
„ Colonel-Commandant	—	3	—	3½

9. To obtain an exact index of the comparative cost of two schemes, the *whole expenditure* under each must be brought to one common point of view. As pay cannot be commuted, this can only be done by referring all pay or retired pay or gratuities to the point of entering the service—say, age 20. The present value of the appointment at that age multiplied by the annual number entering the service gives the true commutation of the whole charge of the service, and therefore a real index of its costs useful for comparison with similar indices of other schemes.

Referred to such a common basis the Index of Cost of the Commissioners Scheme is:—

	£
For the Artillery - -	187,900 yearly.
„ Engineers - -	112,000 „

against, under the existing system—

	£
For the Artillery - -	160,100 yearly.
„ Engineers - -	92,470 „

or, if reduced, to a percentage—

	Existing System.	Commissioners' Proposal.
Artillery - - -	100	117
Engineers - - -	100	122

10. It is to be observed that in this calculation he corps have been treated as wholly paid at British rates. In practice a large portion of any additional expense would fall upon India.

DENHAM ROBINSON
ROBERT DAVEY.

APPENDIX W.

Cost of the Introduction of the Scheme of the Commission for the Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line.

Note by the Secretary.

APP. W.

The intention of the following paper is to show as nearly as it can be ascertained what will be the immediate cost of introducing the Scheme of the Commission for the Household Cavalry, Guards, and Line.

Part I. is a calculation of the Cost of the Scheme so far as it relates to officers who still remain in the ranks they held before purchase was abolished.

It is based on the assumption that the special retirements offered to these officers will be accepted in such numbers that, at the end of five years, promotions, which in the Infantry and Household Cavalry are now in arrear, will have been quickened to the extent that is "adequate to maintain the efficiency of the Army."

If this is accomplished, it is probable that, in the course of the three years following, that is before the end of 1883, all officers who entered the army before purchase was abolished will either have left the service or will have been promoted, and that the new Scheme will be approaching its "normal" operation.

The total cost incurred—assuming all pensions to have been commuted—will have been on an average,—

For the first 5 years, 1,284,411*l.* a year.
For the next 3 years, 561,198*l.* a year.

Part II. shows, as a set-off to this, what expense would be incurred during the same period under existing Acts and Regulations.

Supposing (see Part II. § A) the same promotion to have been secured and the same officers to have retired, the total cost would have been—on an average, assuming as before all pensions to be commuted,—

For the first 5 years, 1,034,928*l.* a year.
For the next 3 years, 401,827*l.* a year.

On this assumption, the extra cost involved by the scheme of the Commissioners would be,—

For the first 5 years, 249,483*l.* a year.
For the next 3 years, 159,371*l.* a year.

This assumption is, however, improbable. As a matter of fact the number of officers selling their commissions under the provisions of the Army Regulation Act has decreased every year.

Section B., Part II., shows what, arguing from the experience of the past, would more probably be the sums which the State would be called upon to pay, under existing Acts and regulations.

These, supposing all pensions to be commuted, would be on an average,—

For the first 5 years, 475,464*l.* a year.
For the next 3 years, 400,203*l.* a year.

On this assumption, which is more probable than the former, but which cannot be accepted as certain, as the small number of sales of late has probably been to some extent owing to exceptional circumstances, the extra cost involved by the scheme would be as follows:—

For the first 5 years, 808,947*l.* a year.
For the next 3 years, 160,995*l.* a year.

The number of officers with purchase rights, remaining in the Service in 1883, would, however, in this case, be, of course, much larger than under the Scheme of the Commission.

Part III. shows what the difference in this respect would probably be.

On the hypotheses assumed in Part I. and in § B. of Part II. the officers still in the service possessing rights to sell their commissions on the terms granted by the Army Regulation Act would be, at the end of the eight years, 468 more under the existing rules, &c. than they would be under the scheme proposed by the Commission.

As already stated, the figures quoted above represent the commuted values of all the pensions granted, and it is, perhaps, thus only that a fair comparison of costs can be obtained.

In practice, however, it is probable that a small proportion only of the pensions granted will be commuted, and the amount of the actual charge which will fall on the estimates in each year will, therefore, be in reality much less than the sums stated.

T. D. Pigott,
Secretary.

Part I.—Guards and Line.

Questions for the War Office Actuaries.

1. Assume the Commissioners' scheme so to operate on the present officers during five years that, at the end of that time, promotion shall have returned to the periods which were the average for the Infantry during the last 30 years of the Purchase System—what will be the cost attributable to the scheme during those five years; and what annual cost will be incurred, subsequently, in maintaining promotion at the same average periods?

2. What would be the cost incurred during the same period under the existing laws and regulations?

Actuaries' Report. (No. 132.)

Part I.—Cost of the Proposals of the Royal Commission.

1. We have taken the actual officers in precise order of seniority, and have carefully ascertained the service of each in his present rank and since he entered the army. These officers, so far as the rules laid down will admit, we have assumed to be promoted by seniority.

2. We have sought to show the Commissioners' proposal in its most expensive form—as being a safer course than an estimate of probable expense which might prove an underestimate. We have, therefore, assumed that no promotion will be made of any officer whose service exceeds the limits laid down, viz., the average of the last 30 years before purchase was abolished:—

On promotion to	Lieutenant-colonel	23½ years.
„	Major - -	19 „
„	Captain - -	9 „

and except as shown below (§§ 4, 9, 14, *Captains*), we have cleared the rank below of all officers whose length of service prohibits their promotion.

3. It will thus be seen that, conformably with the question, the *Infantry* period of promotion has been taken for Cavalry and Guards also.

(Infantry and West India Regiments.)

4. The following retirements from regimental service have been assumed as working under the Scheme of the Royal Commission. Throughout this Report, officers dealt with as holding the rank they had when purchase was abolished are termed "Purchase Officers;" those dealt with in a rank higher than that then held are styled "Post-Purchase Officers."

1. *Lieutenant-colonels*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase Officers:
   Six Staff appointments in 1876 and 6 in 1877, with 20 in each of the following years: [The first batch of Brigade Depôt Commanders vacate in 1878.]
   Officers of 52 years of age quit; but elect to sell for 6,935*l.* in preference to retiring on 600*l.* a year as offered by the Commission.
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase Officers:
   The "five-years' rule" in full operation.
2. *Majors*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase Officers:
   Retire on 292*l.* a year with bonus, 1,960*l.* on completion of 25 years' service.
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase Officers:
   Quit the service after 23½ years' service, on the pension of 250*l.* a year. [The seven years' rule does not operate.]
3. *Captains*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase Officers:
   If ineligible for promotion (by exceeding 19 years' service), complete 20 years of service, and sell out as unattached Majors for 3,200*l.* each.
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Serve on till 20 years' service are completed, and then retire on 200*l.* a year.
4. *Lieutenants*:—
   Quit the army on completing 9 years' service, if not promoted, on the sums awarded by the Commissioners.

5. With the above assumptions we find that the following officers will have to leave the service otherwise than by death, during the next five years:

Lieutenant-colonels.—Purchase:—

To Staff, &c.	52
Retire at age of 52	9
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire to half-pay, under 5 years' rule	74
	135

Majors.—Purchase:—

Sell out	81
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 23½ years' service	108
	189

Captains.—Purchase:—

Sell out at 20 years' service as unattached Majors	591
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 20 years' service	154
	745

Lieutenants—sell out at lump sums after 9 years' service, if not promoted — 813

6. The cost of these several retirements, during the five years ending 1880, would, we estimate, be as follows, all *retired* pensions being taken as commuted:

	£
For Officers retiring as Lieutenant-colonels	806,620
„ „ „ Majors	816,800
„ „ „ Captains	2,283,500
„ „ „ Subalterns	937,140
Total for five years	4,844,060
Annual average	968,812

7. The promotion afforded might be slightly quicker than the average promotion under purchase shown in § 2; in consequence of no officer being assumed to serve beyond the limit laid down by hypothesis for promotion. The action, however, of the five years' rule, and of the 20 years' retirement for captains, would tend to decrease in a greater degree the average service of the officers in each rank as compared with that average under the Purchase System.

For example, from a paper already before the Commission it is shown that the average service of the officers of Infantry in each rank on the 1st November 1871 was:—

Lieutenant-colonels	27¾ years.
Majors	22 „
Captains	14¾ „

With the Commissioners' scheme, worked at the above cost, the average service of all officers in each rank would stand thus:—

	1880. Years.	1883. Years.	Normal from Report 112.
Lieutenant-colonels	24	24	25¼
Majors	20	19	18¼
Captains	11⅔	11	11

So that, on the whole, the officers of the infantry would be a younger body of men.

8. By the year 1883 the purchase officers would have entirely vacated the ranks held by them when purchase was abolished; and the scheme would be approaching its normal action. The average annual cost for the three years 1881–3, would be 431,953*l.*

Cavalry of the Line.

9. The following retirements from regimental service have been assumed:—

1. *Lieutenant-colonels:*—
   (*a.*) Purchase Officers:
   One Staff appointment in 1876 and one in 1877, with 3 in each of two following years.
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase Officers:
   The "five years' rule" in full operation.
2. *Majors:*—
   (*a.*) Purchase Officers:
   Quit the service by sale for 7,774*l.* (as worth more than half-pay) on becoming ineligible (by hypothesis) for promotion, *i.e.*, at 23½ years' service.
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Quit the service after 23½ years' service, by sale for 4,575*l.* as worth more than a pension of 250*l.* a year. [The seven years' rule does not operate.]
3. *Captains:*—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   If ineligible (by exceeding 19 years' service) for promotion, complete 20 years' service, and retire on 180*l.* a year, with over-regulation price of Captains (2,775*l.*)
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Serve on till 20 years' service are completed, and then retire on 200*l.* a year.
4. *Lieutenants:*—
   Quit the army on completing 9 years' service, if not promoted, on the sums awarded by the Commissioners.

10. The following officers will have to leave the service otherwise than by death, during the next five years:

Lieutenant-colonels.—Purchase:—

To Staff, &c.	9
Post-Purchase:	
Retire to half-pay, under 5 years' rule	14
	23

Majors.—Purchase:—

Sell out before 25 years' service	17
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 23½ years' service	Nil
	17

Captains.—Purchase:—

Withdraw at 20 years' service as unattached Majors	60
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 20 years' service	11
	71

Lieutenants—sell out at lump sums after 9 years' service, if not promoted — 79

11. The cost of these several retirements, during the five years ending 1880, would, we estimate, be as follows, all *retired* pensions being taken as commuted:—

	£
For Lieutenant-colonels	210,694
„ Majors	125,600
„ Captains	345,600
„ Subalterns	68,542
Total for five years	750,436
Annual average	150,087

12. The promotion afforded would be less rapid than that under purchase, since Infantry promotion has been made the standard. The retardation would be—

On becoming Captain	1 7/12 years.
„ Major	3 2/12 „
„ Lieutenant-colonel	3 2/12 „

The average service of the officers in each rank on the 1st November 1871 was:—

Lieutenant-colonels	23½ years.
Majors	17¾ „
Captains	11¼ „

With the Commissioners' scheme, worked at the above cost, the average service of all officers in each rank would stand thus:—

	1880. Years.	1883. Years.	Normal rom Report 112.
Lieutenant-colonels	23¼	23¼	22
Majors	20	18⅝	16¾
Captains	12⅝	12⅝	11

So that, on the whole, the officers of the Cavalry would be an older body of men.

APP. W.

13. By the year 1883 the purchase officers would have entirely vacated the ranks held by them when purchase was abolished; and the scheme would be approaching its normal action. The average annual cost for the three years 1881–3, would be 59,143*l.*

HOUSEHOLD CAVALRY.

14. The following retirements from regimental service have been assumed:—

1. *Lieutenant-colonels*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   [None remain.]
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   The "five years' rule" in full operation.
2. *Majors*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   [None remain.]
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Sell for 5,657*l.*, as worth more than a pension of 250*l.* a year. [The seven years' rule does not operate.]
3. *Captains*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   If ineligible (by exceeding 19 years' service) for promotion, complete 20 years' service, and retire on 180*l.* a year, with bonus of 3,857*l.*
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Serve on till 20 years' service are completed, and then retire on 200*l.* a year.
4. *Lieutenants*:—
   Quit the army on completing 9 years' service, if not promoted, on the sums awarded by the Commissioners.

15. The following officers, will have to leave the service otherwise than by death, during the next five years:

Lieut.-colonels.—Post-Purchase:—	
Retire to half-pay under 5 years' rule	2
Majors.—Purchase:—	
Sell out before 25 years' service	Nil
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 23½ years' service	1
Captains.—Purchase:—	
Withdraw at 20 years' service as unattached Majors	3
Post-Purchase:—	
Retire after 20 year's service	Nil
	3
Lieutenants—sell out at lump sums after 9 years' service, if not promoted	15

16. The cost of these several retirements, during the five years ending 1880, would, we estimate, be as follows, all *retired* pensions being taken as commuted:

	£
For Lieutenant-colonels	16,990
„ Majors	5,577
„ Captains	18,470
„ Subalterns	31,592
Total for five years	72,629
Annual average	14,526

17. The promotion afforded would, except to the rank of Captain, be slightly faster than that under purchase.

The average service of the officers in each rank on the 1st November 1871 was:—

Lieutenant-colonels	25½ years.
Majors	19 „
Captains	11 „

With the Commissioners' scheme, worked at the above cost, the service would stand thus:—

	1880. Years.	1883. Years.	Normal from Report 112.
Lieutenant-colonels	22¾	23½	21
Majors	20¼	19½	16
Captains	13½	13¼	11

So that, on the whole, the officers of the Household Cavalry would be an older body of men.

18. By the year 1883, the purchase officers would have entirely vacated the ranks held by them when purchase was abolished; and the scheme would be approaching its normal action. The average annual cost for the three years 1881–3, would be 14,822*l.*

FOOT GUARDS.

19. The following retirements from regimental service have been assumed:—

1. *Lieutenant-colonels (regimentally)*;—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   One Staff appointment in 1877 and 1 in 1880.
2. *Majors (regimentally)*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   Quit the service by sale for 8,400*l.* on becoming ineligible (by hypothesis) for promotion, *i.e.*, when of more than 23½ years' service.
3. *Captains and Lieutenant-colonels*:—
   (*a.*) Purchase:
   If ineligible (by exceeding 19 years' service) for promotion, sell out for 8,400*l.*
   (*b.*) Post-Purchase:
   Serve on till 20 years' service are completed, and then retire on 200*l.* a year, and the over-regulation price of Lieutenant and Captain, 917*l.*
4. *Lieutenants and Captains*:—
   Quit the Army by sale for 2,967*l.* on completing 9 years' service, if not promoted.

20. The following officers will have to leave the service otherwise than by death, during the next five years:

Lieutenant-colonels (regimental):—	
To Staff, &c.	2
Retire at age of 52	Nil
Retire to half-pay under 5 years' rule	1
	3
Majors (regimental):—	
Sell out before 25 years' service	Nil
Retire after 23½ years' service	7
	7
Captains and Lieutenant-colonels:—	
Purchase:	
Sell out at 20 years' service	43
Post-Purchase:	
Retire after 20 years' service	Nil
	43
Lieutenants and Captains sell out after 9 years' service, if not promoted	63

21. The cost of these several retirements, during the five years ending 1880, would, we estimate, be as follows, all *retired* pensions being taken as commuted:

	£
For Lieutenant-colonels, „ Majors, „ Captains and Lieut.-colonels	451,610
„ Lieutenants and Captains, „ Ensigns and Lieutenants	187,070
Total for five years	638,680
Annual average	127,736

22. By the year 1883 the purchase officers would have entirely vacated the ranks held by them when purchase was abolished; and the scheme would be approaching its normal action. The average annual cost for the three years 1881–3, would be 42,140*l.*

Recapitulation.

23. The cost and effects of the proposals of the Royal Commission, all pensions being taken as commuted, may be summarized as follows :—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.	Total.
Charge for retirements, sales, &c.—	£	£	£	£	£
Five years ending - 1880	72,629	750,436	638,680	4,844,060	6,305,805
Three „ „ - 1883	44,465	177,430	126,420	1,295,860	1,644,175
Average annual charge—					
Five years ending - 1880	14,526	150,087	127,736	968,812	1,261,161
From 1881 to - 1883	14,822	59,143	42,140	481,953	548,058
Service of officers on becoming—	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.	
Captain - - 1880	9	9	9	9	—
1883	9	9	9	9	—
Major - - 1880	19	19	19	19	—
1883	19	19	19	19	—
Lieut.-colonel - 1880	23½	23½	23½	23½	—
1883	23½	23½	23½	23½	—
Average service of officers serving as—					
Captain - - 1880	13½	12¾	10½	11½	—
1883	13½	12¾	11½	11	—
Major - - 1880	30½	20	20½	20	—
1883	19½	18¾	20½	19	—
Lieut.-colonel - 1880	22½	23½	23¾	24	—
1883	23¾	23½	25	24	—
Number of officers withdrawing in the rank of—					
Lieutenant - 1876–80	15	79	63	813	970
Captain - - 1876–80	3	71	43	745	862
1881–3	4	39	8	196	247
Major - - 1876–80	1	17	7	189	214
1881–3	1	16	4	142	163
Lieut.-colonel - 1876–80	2	23	3	135	163
1881–3	2	11	1	77	91

The high proportionate cost for Infantry as compared with other arms arises from the fact that, in the latter, the purchase periods of promotion are being gradually lengthened during the years under calculation to the Infantry standard.

The same charges and promotional effects in the *Normal* are shown in our Report No. 112 [Appendix V].

24. The additional cost of the proposals concerning general officers and brevet colonels would, we calculate, stand thus :—

	1876–80.	1881–3.
	£	£
Additional Cost of General Officers consequent on those over 70 passing to a Retired List - -	48,550	39,420
Additional Cost of Brevet-Colonels, accepting 420*l.* a year as retirement [the pension commuted] - - - - - - -	67,700	—
	116,250	39,420
Average per annum - -	23,250	13,140

The effect of this outlay will be to stimulate promotion, and to diminish in some degree the cost of producing retirement among Lieutenant-colonels. This has been allowed for in the previous sections.

The total cost becomes :—

		Annual Average.
	£	£
1876–80 - - - -	6,422,055	1,284,411
1881–3 - - - -	1,683,595	561,198

Part II.—Comparisons of the Cost of the Scheme of the Commission with the Cost which would be incurred under existing Laws and Regulations.

A.

25. It is difficult to establish any direct comparison between the cost of the proposal of the Royal Commission and that which will probably be incurred under the Act (of 1871) for the compensation of officers affected by the abolition of purchase. If the same officers retired who are now supposed to retire, and realized their commissions from the Army Purchase Commissioners, or went to retired pay in cases where it better answered their purpose, the cost would be :— APP. W.

	1876 to 1880.		1881 to 1883.	
	During the 5 Years.	Annual Average.	During the 3 Years.	Annual Average.
	£	£	£	£
Household Cavalry - -	69,997	13,999	39,022	13,007
Cavalry of Line - - -	704,447	140,889	159,710	53,237
Foot Guards - - -	638,680	127,736	126,420	42,140
Infantry of Line - - -	3,761,520	752,304	880,330	293,443
	5,174,644	1,034,928	1,205,482	401,827

It would thus seem that according to the above comparison the *extra cost* involved by the proposed measures, on the hypothesis that equal promotion and an equal number of exits take place, would be :—

	1876 to 1880.		1881 to 1883.	
	During the 5 Years.	Annual Average.	During the 3 Years.	Annual Average.
	£	£	£	£
Household Cavalry - -	2,632	527	5,443	1,815
Cavalry of the Line - -	45,989	9,198	17,720	5,906
Foot Guards - - -	—	—	—	—
Infantry of the Line - -	1,082,540	216,508	415,530	138,510
General officers and Brevet Cols.	116,250	23,250	39,420	13,140
	1,247,411	249,483	478,113	159,371

B.

26. The comparison above (A.) is on the assumption that as many officers will be found willing to sell or retire under existing inducements as are supposed by the hypothesis given to us to be so willing under the proposals of the Royal Commission. Past experience, however, shows that it is improbable that so many would take place under the operation of existing rules. The numbers selling, &c. since purchase was abolished have, as a rule, decreased year by year. If this same ratio of decrease be assumed to continue during succeeding years, we obtain a measure of the promotion to be expected and cost to be incurred if things be left as they are. As being a more probable result than that assumed in A. (§ 24), it furnishes a better comparison of the cost and effect of the proposals of the Royal Commission. On this basis we find that the following results might be expected :—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry.	Total.
Average total service on Promotion :	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	
Promotions in 1880 :—					
To Captain - -	10½	10½	—	13½	—
„ Major - -	—*	18¾	—	23½	—
„ Lieut.-colonel -	—*	24	—	25½	—
Promotions in 1883 :—					
To Captain - -	12¾	10½	—	13½	—
„ Major - -	—*	19¾	—	24½	—
„ Lieut.-colonel -	—*	22	—	28½	—
Average service of all officers serving in the rank :—					
1880.—Serving as Captain	15½	13½	—	18½	—
„ „ Major	26½	21½	—	25½	—
„ „ Lt.-col.	27	25½	—	28	—
1883.—Serving as Captain	17½	14½	—	19½	—
„ „ Major	29½	20½	—	26	—
„ „ Lt.-col.	30	24½	—	29½	—
Numbers quitting the regimental ranks :—					
During the 5 years, 1876–80 - - -	12	144	17	737	910
During the 3 years, 1881–3	4	56	5	331	396
Cost :—	£	£	£	£	£
Five years, 1876–80 -	35,024	624,016	112,440	1,605,844	2,377,324
Annual average -	7,005	124,803	22,488	321,168	475,464
Three years, 1881–3 -	7,109	294,264	40,093	859,143	1,200,609
Annual average - -	2,370	98,088	13,364	286,381	400,203

* No promotions in the year in question.

27. On this comparison the proposals of the Royal Commission (if working to the extent of procuring the promotion which we have been instructed to assume) would show the following excess or diminution of cost :—

APP. W.

+ Excess. − Diminution.	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Foot Guards.	Infantry of Line.	Total.
Cost: —	£	£	£	£	£
Five years, 1876-80	+37,605	+126,420	+526,240	+3,238,216	+3,928,481
Annual average	+7,521	+25,284	+105,248	+647,644	—
General Officers and Brevet Colonels					+116,250
Total					+4,044,731
Total annual average					+808,947
Three years, 1881-3	+37,356	−116,834	+86,327	+436,717	+443,566
Annual average	+12,452	−38,945	+28,776	+145,572	—
General Officers and Brevet Colonels					+39,420
Total					+482,986
Total annual average					+160,995

28. The acceleration of promotion obtained by the above increased charge would be:—

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Infantry.
Average total service on promotion:—	Yrs.	Yrs.	Yrs.
Promotions in 1880:—			
To Captain, earlier by	1½	1½	4½
„ Major „ „	—	—*	4½
„ Lieut.-Col. „ „	—	½	2½
Promotions in 1883:—			
To Captain, earlier by	3½	1½	4½
„ Major „ „	—	½	5½
„ Lieut.-Col. „ „	—	—†	5

* Retardation, ½ year. † Retardation, 1½ years.

(*continued in next column.*)

	Household Cavalry.	Cavalry of Line.	Infantry.
Average service of all officers serving in the rank:—			
1880.—Serving as Captain, less by	2½	1	6½
„ „ Major, „	5½	1½	5½
„ „ Lieut.-Col. „	4½	2	4
1883.—Serving as Captain, „	4½	1½	8½
„ „ Major, „	10	2	7
„ „ Lieut.-Col. „	6½	1½	5½

29. The promotion to the rank of Major-general which would fall to Brevet Colonels would, we estimate, be—

In 1876 colonels of 1863 would be promoted.
„ 1877 „ 1865 „ „
„ 1878 „ 1866 „ „
„ 1879 „ 1868 „ „
„ 1880 „ 1869 „ „
„ 1881 „ 1870 „ „
„ 1882 „ 1871 „ „
„ 1883 „ 1872 „ „

Part III.—Comparison of the "Purchase Rights" of Officers remaining after Eight Years, under the Scheme of the Commission and under existing Laws and Regulations respectively.

30. The foregoing comparison shows an increased non-effective charge [allowing for commutation] during the next eight years of 4,458,287*l.*; in return for which there would be the augmented promotion stated in § 27. To complete the comparison, we annex a statement of the officers, with purchase rights, who would remain with regiments in 1883, to be retired (unless they die) under the respective schemes, with the value of the Commissions they held in 1871:

ESTIMATE OF OFFICERS WITH PURCHASE RIGHTS REMAINING IN REGIMENTS IN 1883,

Rank in 1871.	Rank in 1883.	Army Regulation Act, &c. No.	Army Regulation Act, &c. Value.	Proposal of Royal Commission. No.	Proposal of Royal Commission. Value.
Household Cavalry.					
			£		£
Major	Lieutenant-colonel	3	26,270	—	—
Captain	Captain	12	84,850	2	45,253
	Major	3		3	
	Lieutenant-colonel	—		3	
Lieutenant	Captain	8	11,784	14	20,622
Cornet	Lieutenant	4	22,320	—	9,920
	Captain	14		8	
		44	145,224	30	77,795
Cavalry of the Line.					
Major	Lieutenant-Colonel	5	38,870	2	15,548
Captain	Major	9	150,975	34	279,075
	Captain	24		27	
Lieutenant	Major	27	180,703	2	193,893
	Captain	110		145	
Cornet	Captain	60	27,000	98	44,100
		235	397,548	308	512,616
Foot Guards.					
Captain and Lieut.-Colonel	Captain and Lieut.-Colonel	36	302,400	5	42,000
Lieutenant and Captain	Captain and Lieut.-Colonel	45	180,987	7	20,832
	Lieutenant and Captain	16		—	
Ensign and Lieutenant	Captain and Lieut.-Colonel	—	60,000	20	48,000
	Lieutenant and Captain	50		20	
		147	543,387	52	110,832
Infantry of the Line.					
Major	Lieut.-Colonel	21	98,469	—	—
Captain	Lieut.-Colonel	127	1,616,354	149	733,856
	Major	297		155	
	Captain	287		—	
Lieutenant	Major	—	640,800	182	534,400
	Captain	801		486	
Ensign	Captain	127	143,550	448	201,600
	Lieutenant	192		—	
		1,852	2,499,173	1,420	1,469,856

Resumé. APP. W.

	Army Regulation Act.		Proposal of a Royal Commission.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
		£		£
Household Cavalry - -	44	145,224	30	77,795
Cavalry of Line - - -	235	397,548	308	512,616
Foot Guards - - -	147	543,387	52	110,832
Infantry of Line - - -	1,852	2,499,173	1,420	1,469,856
	2,278	3,585,332	1,810	2,171,099

31. The value of commissions still outstanding in 1883 would thus be 1,414,233*l.* to the credit of the proposal of the Royal Commission. This sum deducted from the 4,458,287*l.* shown above as the increased non-effective charge leaves a net result of 3,044,054*l.* as a fairer estimate of the increased charge (as regards officers with purchase rights) involved by the proposal of the Royal Commission.

32. The present dying-out charge for officers already retired is excluded from both sides of these calculations.

33. Commissions have been treated as always saleable at the full average value shown in Appendix G. to the report of the Royal Commission on Officers' Memorials.

34. In consequence of these calculations having been commenced last year, the period referred to as 1876–80, is, in reality, that from 1st July 1875 to 30 June 1880. To have made the starting-point six months later would have involved the recasting of all the work done.

35. For the purposes of comparison we have regarded every commutable pension, *i.e.* every pension constituting a permanent retirement, as being commuted at the time it is granted. This gives the best basis of comparison, as affording an approximation to a present value; but it shows the charge as heavier during early years than would actually fall upon the army estimates for those years.

36. As some guide to the probable sum which might be expected to fall upon the Army Estimates and estimates of the Army Purchase Commission taken together, during the next few years, we calculate that the gross annual non-effective charge during the five years 1876–80, would average 1,384,167*l.*, and during the three years 1881–3 would average 674,438*l.*

This sum will include the—

(1.) Pay of honorary colonels;
(2.) The unattached pay of general officers;
(3.) The retired or half-pay of other officers;
(4.) The sale of commissions;
(5.) The dying-out list referred to in § 30.

Of these sums, under present arrangements, India bears its share with the exception of item 4. Any measure tending to produce retirement by acceptance of pension rather than by sale of commission, will tend to throw upon India a charge for non-effective more proportionate to the force serving there than is now paid.

DENHAM ROBINSON.
ROBERT DAVEY.

11th May 1876.

APPENDIX X. APP. X.

COST OF THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SCHEME OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE ORDNANCE CORPS.

QUESTION FOR THE ACTUARIES.

What cost and result in promotion in the Ordnance Corps may be looked for from the scheme of the Royal Commission up to the year 1885?

PART I.

ROYAL ARTILLERY.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 143.)

1. The points assumed as likely to operate during this period have been—

(*a.*) An addition of nine to the general officers, all falling to the British list, as the Indian lists are already in excess by one.
(*b.*) Retirement of general officers at the age of 70.
(*c.*) Colonels hereafter promoted to become supernumerary after five years in the rank. The rank to begin to die out after the promotion of the last of the present lieutenant-colonels.
Colonels to accept retired full pay at an average amount of 550*l.* as soon after promotion as there may be vacancies on the establishment of 42,400*l.* a year, as explained in our Report, No. 113, § 3 (App. L., page 252).
(*d.*) Lieutenant-colonels promoted hereafter to pass to half-pay after five years in the rank, or to retire on 450*l.*
(*e.*) Majors promoted hereafter to retire on 300*l.* a year after seven years in the rank if they have 27 years' service in all.
(*f.*) As regards existing officers, the present retirements to be continued.

2. We have applied the same rules for retirement to the Indian lists, and have credited the British list with the consequent additional promotions.

3. The retirement of general officers will operate from the first.

4. Colonels will commence to become supernumerary in 1881. The last of the present lieutenant-colonels will be promoted in 1885, and the rank of regimental colonel will cease in 1890.

5. Lieutenant-colonels will commence to quit the regiment, under the five years' rule, in 1881.

6. The seven years' rule for retirement will not touch the majors until 1884.

7. We believe that the promotion will be as shown in the following table:—

Total Service on Promotion to the Rank of—

	General Officer.	Regimental Colonel.	Lieutenant-Colonel.	Major.	Captain.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
End of 1876 -	34	31	25	19	13
„ 1877 -	35	31	26	20	12
„ 1878 -	36	32	26	21	13
„ 1879 -	37	33	27	22	13
„ 1880 -	37	33	27	22	13
„ 1881 -	38	34	27	22	13
„ 1882 -	38	33	28	22	12
„ 1883 -	36	33	28	22	12
„ 1884 -	37	34	29	22	12
„ 1885 -	38	35	29	21	12

APP. X.

This compares with the promotion under existing rules as shown in our Report, No. 113 [App. L., page 253]. The acceleration by the year 1885 is as follows:—

Junior major-general, younger by	-	5 years.
„ colonel (regimental) „	-	0 „
„ lieutenant-colonel „	-	1 „
„ major „	-	3 „
„ captain „	-	2 „

8. The average annual charge upon the estimates for non-effective to procure the promotion shown in our report No. 113, (that is, under the existing system) would be:—

	£
For general officers - -	24,573
For retired full-pay - -	43,736
	68,309

Under the proposals now before us this would become:

	£
For general officers - -	29,317
For retired full-pay - -	43,736
For colonels made supernumerary after five years - - - -	1,960
For lieutenant-colonels on half-pay under the five years' rule - - -	2,268
For majors retired or 300*l.* after seven years as major - - - -	1,030
	78,311

Showing an average increased charge of 10,002*l.* a year.

9. No account is taken here of any additional charge thrown upon India on account of the Indian lists of Artillery officers.

10. The normal action of the scheme is shown in our Report No. 140. [Appendix V. page 271.]

DENHAM ROBINSON.
22nd July 1876. ROBERT DAVEY.

PART II.

ROYAL ENGINEERS.

ACTUARIES' REPORT. (No. 144.)

1. The points assumed as likely to operate during the period are—

(*a.*) *General Officers.*—Seven to be added to the effective list, and all to pass to a retired list at the age of 70.

(*b.*) *Colonels.*—To be reduced at once by seven. All appointed hereafter to become supernumerary after five years in the rank; and the rank to begin to die out as soon as the last of the present lieutenant-colonels shall have been promoted.

(*c.*) *Lieutenant-Colonels.*—All promoted hereafter to pass to half-pay after five years in the rank, or to retire on 450*l.*

(*d.*) *Majors.*—Those promoted hereafter to be majors to retire on 300*l.* a year if not promoted after seven years in rank, provided they have 27 years' service in all.

(*e.*) The ranks to be arranged in the following proportion:—

Lieut.-colonels	-	110
Majors	-	143
Captains	-	198
Subalterns	-	361
		807

(*f.*) The present retirements to be continued in addition to the above as regards existing officers.

2. The distribution of officers among the four lists, according to the July 1876 Army List, is as follows:—

Rank.	British.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.
General officers -	18	8	3	5	34
Colonels - -	23	9	5	5	42
Lieutenant-colonels -	50	23	11	14	98
Majors - - -	77	31	23	20	151
Captains - -	128	35	9	12	184
Lieutenants - -	371	—	—	—	371
	667	106	51	56	880

To carry out art. (*e.*) this distribution should, we think, be:—

Rank.	British.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.
General officers -	23	8	5	5	41
Colonels - -	18	9	3	5	35
Lieutenant-colonels -	56	24	15	15	110
Majors - - -	73	31	19	20	143
Captains - -	144	34	9	11	198
Lieutenants - -	353	—	—	—	353
	667	106	51	56	880

3. We have applied similar rules to the Indian Lists, and have allowed for the effect in calculating the promotion on the British List.

The retirement of general officers would commence at once in all the Lists.

3. The removal of colonels to the supernumerary list under the five years' rule would begin in 1881, but the rank will only commence to die out in 1885.

4. Lieutenant-colonels would be removed to half-pay, or would retire from and after the year 1881.

5. The retirement of majors on 300*l.* a year would only happen in the year 1883.

6. Promotion up to 1885 would, we calculate, be as follows:—

Service on Promotion to the rank of

End of Year.	General Officer.	Colonel.	Lieut.-Colonel.	Major.	Captain.
1876 -	35	31	24	19	13
1877 -	35	32	23	20	14
1878 -	36	32	24	21	14
1879 -	36	33	25	22	15
1880 -	37	34	26	23	15
1881 -	38	34	26	22	13
1882 -	39	35	27	22	13
1883 -	37	35	27	22	13
1884 -	38	35	27	23	13
1885 -	38	31	28	22	14

This promotion compares with that shown in our Report, No. 124, [Appendix L, page 254] and affords the following acceleration of promotion by the end of 1885:—

General officer, earlier by	3	years.
Colonel „	5	„
Lieut.-Colonel „	2	„
Majors „	2	„
Captains „	2	„

7. The cost of the present system would be, we estimate—

	£
General officers - -	13,180
Retired full pay - -	21,500
	34,680

The cost of Commissioners' proposals for the 9 years would average yearly—

	£
General officers - -	17,344
Colonels, supernumerary -	1,245
Lieut.-Colonels on half-pay -	1,697
Majors, retired - -	291
Retired full pay - -	21,500
	42,077

Showing an average increased charge of 7,397*l.* a year.

8. No account is taken of the charge upon India for officers on the Indian Lists.

10. The normal action of the scheme is shown in our report, No. 140 [Appendix V., page 271].

DENHAM ROBINSON.
25th July 1876. ROBERT DAVEY.

APPENDIX Y.

Royal Commissions and Committees on Questions connected with the Amalgamation of the British and Indian Armies.

The following is a list of the principal Royal Commissions and Committees which have inquired into questions connected with the amalgamation of Her Majesty's army with the army of the late East India Company, and the consequent relations of the officers of the two services:—

1.—1860. A Committee "to consider the details for "carrying out the amalgamation of the Local Indian "and Line Armies."
Chairman, Lord Hotham.

2.—1863. A Royal Commission on "the Memorials of "Indian Officers."
Chairman, Lord Cranworth.

3.—1869. A Committee on "The Supersession of Colonels "of Her Majesty's Army by those of the late East India "Company."
Chairman, Colonel C. R. Egerton.

4.—1869. A Committee on "The Supersession of Colonels "of Her Majesty's British Army by the Colonels of Her "Majesty's Indian Forces."
Chairman, Vice-Chancellor Sir W. M. James.

5.—1870. A Select Committee on "Army (Colonels)."
Chairman, Major, the Hon. A. Anson.

6.—1871. A Royal Commission on "The Supersession "of Colonels of the British Army."
Chairman, Lord Cairns.

APPENDIX Z.

Note on the Succession of Officers of the British Army and of the Indian Staff Corps to the Establishment of General Officers List.

Before the amalgamation of the English and Indian armies in 1861, there were for the British Army, excluding the Royal Marines, who had a separate establishment, three lists of General Officers,—

(1.) For the Guards and Line,
(2.) For the Artillery,
(3.) For the Engineers,

making a total at that time of 308, which has since been increased.

These constituted the "fixed establishment" of General Officers, to which all Colonels, if properly qualified, succeeded as vacancies occurred, according to seniority.

There was besides this another list of General Officers, with no restriction as to number, on which Colonels were placed who had not qualified for the fixed establishment before their turn for promotion came. These were virtually titular generals only. They continued to receive only the half-pay of their last regimental commission, but succeeded to the higher ranks pari passu with the surviving Officers on the "establishment," who were next junior to them on the list of Colonels.

In the Indian Army the system was different. There was one list only of General Officers, to which Artillery, Engineers, Cavalry, and Infantry from all the Presidencies succeeded in common, according to their seniority on the list of Colonels.

After the amalgamation, it was thought desirable, with a view to the ultimate consolidation of the two armies, that a common system of promotion to the rank of Major-General should be adopted, and accordingly the English system of separate lists for the different branches was extended to India.

Of the 220 General Officers who constituted the Indian establishment at the time, 26 were given to the Artillery, and 12 to the Engineers.

The remaining 182 were joined to the English Guards and Line "fixed establishment," and it was decided that, as soon as a certain line had been reached in promotion (which was drawn at colonels dating before the 18th February 1861,—the date on which the Royal Warrant establishing the Staff Corps was received in India,*), the English and Indian Officers should succeed in common to the amalgamated list.

This arrangement was pronounced by Lord Cranworth's Commission, which sat in 1863, to be an infringement of the guaranteed rights of the Indian Officers, most of whom were junior to the English Officers, and whose promotion would consequently have been delayed by the amalgamation.

The list was accordingly divided again; the 182 Generals were given back for the time to the old Indian Line Officers, and it was laid down by the warrant of 1864, that up to a certain point, explained below, these should succeed to all vacancies on the Indian General Officers' list according to seniority.

So far as the Indian Officers were concerned, the plan was, on the whole, satisfactory, but, unfortunately it, in its turn, gave rise to substantial grievance in another direction, as the Indian promotion being quicker than that in the English Army, the English Colonels found themselves constantly superseded by their juniors in the Indian service, who reached the rank of Major-General before them.

The grievance was admitted by the Royal Commission over which Lord Cairns presided in 1871, and was to some extent met by an antedate which was given to English Officers on becoming General Officers.

The Officers who had the right of succession to the Indian Generals' list were, however, of two classes; there were the "*local*" Officers and the Officers of the "*Staff Corps*" of the three presidencies, which had been formed when the old Indian regiments were broken up after the mutiny.

The local Officers are dying out, and, as a class, will cease to exist when the last survivor of the old local army leaves the service.

The Staff Corps, on the other hand, is a permanent institution, and is kept alive by constant fresh appointments as vacancies occur.

If, therefore, the amalgamation of the Generals' lists, which had been postponed in consequence of the opinion expressed by Lord Cranworth's Commission, was ever to be carried out, it was clear that the two classes could not be treated in the same manner, and that a point must be fixed at which the Staff Corps Colonels should begin to take their chance of promotion with those on the British list.

A line was accordingly drawn immediately below the junior Lieutenant-Colonels who had reached that rank before the 18th February 1861.

When this point was reached, which was in 1871, all the Indian General Officers then on the list and who belonged to the Staff Corps (45 in all), were at once transferred from the Indian to the British Establishment, and it was arranged that for every future vacancy on the Indian list falling to a Staff Corps Officer, an addition of one should be made to the home list, and filled by the promotion of the senior qualified Colonel, whether belonging to the Guards, Line, or Staff Corps.

From the date on which the line was reached, the Colonels of the Staff Corps were, in return, to take their share of vacancies occurring on the English Establishment.

For every new addition thus made to the English list, a corresponding reduction was to be made in the Indian list, and the process was to be continued gradually, until the number of General Officers added to the British Establishment amounted to one for every 28 combatant Officers of the Staff Corps, after which the Local Officers would have undivided succession to vacancies occurring among the Generals still remaining on the Indian list.

By this means it was thought that the Indian Officers' guaranteed rights would be substantially preserved, whilst

* See G.O.G.G., No. 332 of 10th April 1861, § 103.

APP. Z.

the desired consolidation of the two lists would be gradually carried out.

There is a complicated arrangement for regulating the relative ranks of the Staff Corps and Local Officers who were thus separated, laid down by ss. 10 and 11 of the Indian Warrant of the 21st December 1871, but as there is no question regarding the Local Officers before the Commission, it is not necessary to detail it here.

The amalgamation of the staff and home lists is, however, giving rise to a great many inequalities. It was calculated by the War Office actuaries in 1873 that for the next four years or so the Staff Corps Colonels would be without a single step, but that after that they would monopolise far more than their share, until, in 1905 they would have secured about 124 more than their proper proportion.

Since this calculation (Actuaries' Report No. 53), which will be found below, was made, special terms of retirement have been offered to Colonels of the Staff Corps and accepted by them to an extent which may materially affect the figures quoted above.

Substantially, however, the difficulty remains unchanged. It has its origin in the different constitutions of the Staff Corps and regular Army.

In the former the rank of Colonel is obtained by mere length of service by every officer who remains sufficiently long in the service. In the regular Army, on the contrary, no Officer can become a Colonel without having obtained a "*qualification*" by serving for a certain time in one of a limited number of qualifying appointments.

The effect of the two systems is, therefore, that the proportion of Officers entering the service who become Colonels must, so long as the existing regulations remain unchanged, be larger in the Staff Corps than in the regular Army; and as all Colonels from the two services now succeed in common to the Generals' List, the Staff Corps' Officers will on the average absorb more than their proper proportion of appointments as Major-General.

It is to this that the last question referred to the Commission relates, viz.:—

"In what way the relations of the officers of our British forces to Officers of our Indian Staff Corps may be so adjusted as to do justice to each."

T. D. PIGOTT,
Secretary.

27th May 1875.

(WAR OFFICE ACTUARIES' REPORT No. 53.)

ON PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF GENERAL OFFICER.

1. Prior to the amalgamation of the British and Indian Armies there were fixed establishments of General Officers for each.

For the British Service there were four distinct branches of General Officers, which severally gave promotion to four distinct lists of Colonels [nominally, these colonels composed one list], viz.:

Guards and Line	260
Artillery	32
Engineers	16
Marines	10
	318

The Indian Army had 220 General Officers on one list, giving promotion to all arms in the three Presidencies according to seniority as Colonel.

[It has been alleged that each establishment was framed on the basis of one General Officer for 28 full-pay combatant Officers; but that, as regards the British Guards and Line, it was overlooked that promotion to General Officer was secured to a large number of Field Officers on half-pay, and that thus the British had a smaller proportion of General Officers than the Indians.]

2. Partly from the smaller proportionate number of officers who had to look to one General Officer for promotion, and partly on account of the numerous retirements which took place after the Mutiny, the promotion of Indian Officers exceeded in rapidity that of British Officers, and gave rise to the well-known case of "Indian Supersession.' When this supersession reached its height, an Indian Colonel (Shakespear) of the 18th February, 1866, became a Major-General before a British Colonel of the 20th July 1858. Some remedy was provided by antedating British Major-Generals as they went up; the intensity of the supersession is now rapidly diminishing, and it will disappear in eight or nine years. It is at present, moreover, only effected by Officers of the moribund Local Army.

3. There has always been a certain amount of supersession among the several sections of the British Establishment; but they seem to have worked with moderate evenness.

4. The first result of the amalgamation of the Armies was to follow on the Indian Establishment the example set by the British Establishment, and to separate the Artillery and Engineer Generals from those of the Cavalry and Infantry. For this purpose 26 Artillery and 12 Engineer General Officers were subtracted from the 220 and formed into separate lists, giving promotion to separate lists of Colonels. The remaining 182 General Officers were to be amalgamated with the British 260 for Guards and Line, giving together 442 which should afford promotion to all British and Indian Officers of Cavalry and Infantry according to seniority as Colonel.

5. The Indian Colonels were as a body much junior to the British Colonels. Consequently, the amalgamation deprived them of the early promotion they had expected. This brought up the question of the "guarantee," and Lord Cranworth's Commission. From that Commission resulted the Warrant of 1864, cancelling the amalgamation of the Cavalry and Infantry General Officers' Lists; and laying down that as long as any Officers of the Local Army remained unpromoted to General Officers' rank, they should have their separate establishments of General Officers. The Officers in the intermediate state represented by the three Indian Staff Corps were to have their full Indian promotion to a certain point [reached in 1871]; and from that time they were to form for promotion one list with the British Colonels, their General Officers being at the same time transferred to the British Establishment in reduction of the 182 left for the Indian *Local* Officers.

6. There have been certain minor adjustments and additions to the British List, which it would be confusing to detail.

The result now stands thus:—

There are seven separate lists of General Officers supplied from seven separate lists of Colonels [who are nominally, but not really, on two lists]—

No. 1.	British Artillery	32
No. 2.	(Late) Indian Artillery	26
No. 3.	British Engineers	16*
No. 4.	(Late) Indian Engineers	12
No. 5.	Marines	13
No. 6.	Guards, Line, and Indian Staff Corps — To be raised gradually to about 375	333
No. 7.	Local Indian Officers — To be reduced gradually to about 73.	115

Many years hence No. 2 will merge in No. 1; and No. 4 will merge in No. 3. At about the same time No. 7 will disappear altogether.

7. In seven different lists of Colonels belonging to corps with different systems of promotion prevailing in them, it cannot but be that supersession will arise; and the Colonels next for promotion to Major-General on the several lists are thus dated:

List No. 1.	Seniority as Colonel	24 Sept. 1858
„ 2.	„ „	26 Feb. 1864
„ 3.	„ „	21 May 1862
„ 4.	„ „	13 Oct. 1863
„ 5.	„ „	13 Dec. 1865
„ 6.	„ „	23 April 1860
„ 7.	„ „	18 Feb. 1866

8. On lists 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, every vacancy falls to the senior Colonel of that particular section.

On list 6 (an increasing list), every vacancy will fall to British Colonels until 1878, inclusive, by which year it is estimated there will be 328 British to 38 Staff Corps General Officers. Afterwards the Staff Corps Colonels will obtain a large proportion of the promotions, inasmuch as by 1896 the Staff Corps General Officers will outnumber

* To be shortly raised to 18.

the British General Officers; and they will exceed them in 1905 by 224 to 153.*

On list 7 (a decreasing list), up to 1878, inclusive, every vacancy which would have fallen to a Staff Corps Colonel, if the Staff Corps and local Indian Colonels had continued on one list for promotion, will actually give promotion to a British Colonel. A vacancy falling to a local Colonel will promote him. After 1878 every vacancy (on the reduced list of 73) will fall to a local Colonel, so long as there is a local Colonel left.

9. Supersession as among the seven different lists could be stopped by throwing them all into one list of General Officers, and promoting thereto according to seniority as Colonel.

There are the following objections to this course :—

1st. Lord Cairns' Commission has decided that it would be inconsistent with the Parliamentary Guarantee if applied to List No. 7.

2nd. The same objection would perhaps apply as regards Lists 2 and 4.

3rd. It is presumed there was some good object in originally giving the Artillery and Engineers separate establishments.

4th. There would be the danger that Colonels from the different arms would come up for promotion in unfair proportions; which would reproduce the difficulty now arising between the Guards and Line on one hand and the Indian Staff Corps on the other.

10. Under existing rules the Colonels of the British Guards and Line and the Colonels of the Indian Staff Corps rise on one list, according to seniority, to the rank of Major-General. The Establishment of General Officers which affords promotion to this list has been thus composed :—

Contributed by Guards and Line - -	275
„ Indian Staff Corps -	100
	375

By proportion the division of the 26 promotions to be annually expected would be—

To British Colonels - - -	19½
To Staff Corps Colonels - - -	6½
	26

11. The rank of Colonel is attained on different principles by the British Officers and the Indian Staff Corps Officers.

The *British Officer* has (speaking generally) a limited establishment of from 180 to 200 Lieutenant-Colonelcies, one of which he must hold for five years before he can become a Colonel; so that, if the promised promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel at the average of 45 is maintained, a large number of British Officers must quit the service without becoming Colonels.

The *Indian Staff Corps Officer* is not retarded by any limitation to the number in the rank. The mere continuation of existence in the service for 31 years will make him a Colonel, with right of succession to Major-General. Moreover, voluntary retirement from the higher Staff Corps grades has been almost stopped by guaranteeing Colonel's allowances (corresponding to, though better than, the British honorary Colonelcy) to every officer of 38 years' service. [There are already 173 such officers against the 148 honorary Colonels in the British service.]

12. The result of becoming Colonels on different principles is that, although the Indian Staff Corps have in all less than half the number of combatant Officers which the British Lists have, and have contributed but $\frac{4}{15}$ths of the Establishment of General Officers, the number of Staff Corps Colonels who, after 1878, will come up for promotion to Major-General, will exceed those of the British List.* It is estimated that the numbers will stand as follows :—

—	British Colonels.	Staff Corps Colonels.
To be promoted in 1879 - -	4	23
„ 1880 - -	12	8
„ 1881 - -	8	12
„ 1882 - -	8	12
„ 1883 - -	10	10
„ 1884 - -	7	13
„ 1885 - -	6	14
„ 1886 to 1890 -	30	70
„ 1891 to 1905 -	120	180
In the Normal state, annually - - at worst	12	14
In the Normal state, annually - - at best	13½	12½

This represents a grievous prospective loss of promotion to the British Officers.

13. As the previous Indian promotion was so rapid, the first Staff Corps Colonel for promotion (Salmon) is far down the list. His promotion will not come till 1879. Before that time the British Colonels will have taken from the Staff Corps 56 promotions to Major-General. In 1879 the tide will turn, and the British Colonels will continue to lose promotions in favour of Staff Corps Colonels. By the early part of 1885 they will have lost their previous gain of 56; and by 1905 they will have, in addition, lost, in favour of the Staff Corps, 124 of their own proper promotions.

14. A remedy is sought for the prospective loss to the British Colonels; and it might not be fair to defer that remedy until the British Colonels have taken the 56 steps from the Indian Staff Corps [10 of those steps have already fallen to the British List].

15. Remedies have been suggested :—

1st. To separate the Staff Corps Colonels from the British List, and to join them again to the Local List.

2nd. To increase the British Establishment of General Officers.

3rd. To promote the next British Colonel on the death of a British General Officer, and to make any Staff Corps Colonels senior to him supernumerary General Officers.

DENHAM ROBINSON.

14th May 1873. ROBERT DAVEY.

* [NOTE, 1876.—The liberal retirements which have been offered to and extensively accepted by Indian Staff Corps Colonels since the above paper was written will modify the conclusions as to the outnumbering of British by Indian Staff Officers on the Establishment of General Officers.]

REPORTS ON SPECIAL SUBJECTS REFERRED TO THE ROYAL COMMISSION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.

Since the issue of our Commission, we have received from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for War several papers which are printed with this, and we have been desired to express our views on the questions raised in them.

They are three in number:—

1st. The grant of local rank to certain officers of Her Majesty's British Army when serving in India;
2nd. The conditions which, under the Royal Warrants now in force, attach to the grant of the rank of brevet-major to captains as a reward for distinguished service in the field; and
3rd. The emoluments granted to officers appointed Colonels of Cavalry Regiments since the 12th of August 1873.

As regards the first of these,

The Grant of Local Rank in India,

Local rank in India.

we have carefully considered the correspondence which took place between the Secretary of State for India and His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief in relation to this subject, and we find that it was proposed by the former and accepted by the latter that the system of giving local rank to officers of Her Majesty's British Army serving in India which was then about to be inaugurated should "*cease in its application to the several grades of the Army on the extinction of those grades among the officers of the Indian Army.*"

We think that this understanding ought to be adhered to, and that, as we are given to understand that the grade of Lieutenant has become extinct in the Indian Army, the "local rank" in respect to that grade ought to be discontinued.

Whether at the present time or in the future any fresh regulations may be required on the subject is a question which we leave for the consideration of the military authorities.

As regards the second of the special questions referred to us,

The Position of Officers advanced to the Rank of Major for Distinguished Service in the Field,

Brevet majorities conferred for distinguished service.

we have considered the memorandum handed to us, but after a full consideration of its contents we are unable to recommend that any change should be made in the incidents or advantages which attach to the brevet promotions of those officers.

As regards the third question on which we are asked to express our opinion relating to—

The Emoluments attached to Colonelcies of Cavalry Regiments,

Colonelcies of Cavalry Regiments.

referred to us in Mr. Secretary Hardy's letter dated the 8th November 1875, we have considered the matter, and by our directions a report on the subject has been prepared by the War Office Actuaries, and a memorandum furnished to us by the Accountant-General of the Army, both of which are printed with this. We are of opinion that the arrangements now in force with regard to the pay of colonels of Cavalry Regiments require modifications so far as they relate to officers appointed to those positions since the issue of Her Majesty's Warrant of the 12th August 1873, and to the officers who had obtained the position of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels before the prices of Cavalry Commissions were reduced to Infantry rates, and who may hereafter be appointed Colonels.

The emoluments to be assigned to these officers might in each case be made the subject of an actuarial calculation, which, we are informed, would be a simple one and easily made, with reference to the interests of the officers concerned.

In making that calculation the class of officers taken as the standard of comparison should be those designated in the report made to us by the War Office actuaries as "*Class A.*" vizt., Colonels appointed before 1860 having 1,350*l.* a year subject to repayment of the "*difference.*"

But considering the number of officers to whom the matter would apply we have to suggest that it might be better in all such cases to adopt the uniform sum of 1,185*l.* a year which appears to be the average of the five sums calculated by the actuaries as representing the fair interests of the five Generals appointed Colonels of Cavalry Regiments since the 12th August 1873.

We make this recommendation because we find that the principle on which it is framed has already been acted upon in the case of officers of the Royal Artillery by Her Majesty's Warrant of the 5th of July 1872.

(Signed) PENZANCE.
HAMPTON.
E. P. BOUVERIE.
E. B. JOHNSON.
ARTHUR HERBERT.
R. E. WELBY.
CHARLES FOSTER.

T. DIGBY PIGOTT,
Secretary.

5th August 1876.

APPENDIX.

Local Rank in India.

20
Gen. No. 1186.

Sir, Pall Mall, May 7th, 1875.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to refer for the consideration of the Royal Commission on Army Promotion, the accompanying correspondence regarding the promotion of Officers of the British Service to the local rank of Captain in India after 12 years' service.

I am, &c.

The Secretary, Ralph Thompson.
Royal Commission on Army Promotion,
War Office.

No. 241 H. Military.

Sir, India Office, S.W., April 7th, 1875.

I of 1875. I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to forward a letter and its enclosures received from the Government of India, which relates to the question whether the promotion of Officers of the British Service to the local rank of Captain in India after 12 years' service should not now cease.

2. This local rank was conferred by Her Majesty on the recommendation of H.R.H. the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief in consequence of the measures taken in 1864 for the regulation of army promotion in the Indian Staff Corps and local services. Under the regulations there laid down army promotion by length of service of the Staff Corps Officers ceases on the extinction of certain grades in the local services. There being now no Lieutenants in the local Army, the promotion of Staff Corps Officers not entitled to substantive promotion to be Captains by brevet on completion of 12 years' service has ceased, but it will be observed that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India continues to give local rank to subalterns of the British Army serving in India, inasmuch as this rank being conferred in virtue of the authority received by His Excellency from Her Majesty through H.R.H. the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief cannot be discontinued without Her Majesty's express command.

3. Lord Salisbury concurs in the opinion expressed by the Government of India that this local rank to British Officers having been sanctioned solely as a consequence of the grant of Brevet promotion to Staff Corps and Indian Officers should cease when that Brevet rank is no longer given, and he trusts therefore that H.R.H. the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief will see fit to recommend to Her Majesty that the necessary instructions for that purpose be given to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India.

I have, &c.
T. T. Pears,
Major-General, Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary,
Horse Guards.

No. 21 of 1875, Military Department.

To the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

My Lord Marquis,

We have the honour to forward for the consideration and orders of Her Majesty's Government, a copy of the papers noted in the margin, relating to an inquiry, whether, with reference to paras. 69 and 70 of G. G. O. No. 632 of 1864, promotion of officers of the British service to the brevet rank of Captain after 12 years' service should not now cease.

Cons. June 1874, No. 964 to 966.
Cons. September 1874, Nos. 1642 and 1643.
Cons. January 1875, Nos. 1355 and 1356.

We are, &c.
(Signed) Northbrook.
„ B. H. Ellis.
„ H. W. Norman.
„ A. Hobhouse.
„ E. C. Bayley.
„ W. Muir.

Fort William, the 29th January 1875.
Examined, J. Kennedy.

Extract.—Fort William Military Consultation for June 1874.

[No. 964.] From Colonel J. Macdonald, Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Military Department, to Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department (No. 1427, dated Bombay Castle, the 14th April 1874).

I am directed to forward, for consideration by the Government of India, the accompanying copy of a letter from the Adjutant-General, No. 6M., dated 31st March 1874, with enclosure, submitting the question as regards the promotion of Lieutenant Seton, Staff Corps, to the brevet rank of Captain, with reference to para. 71 of G.O.G.I., No. 379 of 1864.

From Brigadier-General to C. T. Aitchison, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Secretary to Government, Bombay, Military Department (No. 6M., dated Mahableshwar, the 31st March 1874).

In submitting the annexed General Draft Order recommending that Lieutenant Seton, Staff Corps, be promoted to the brevet rank of Captain, I am to observe that in accordance with para. 71 of the despatch of the Secretary of State, republished in G.G.O., No. 379 of 1864, promotion to the brevet rank of Captain should cease on the extinction of the grade of Lieutenant in the Indian army.

Cochrane, page 432.

2. As it is believed that all the Lieutenants in the Indian army have now been promoted to Captain, I am directed to suggest that the question of Lieutenant Seton's promotion be referred to the Government of India.

Draft General Order.

The under-mentioned officer having completed 12 years' service, to be Captain by brevet from the date specified, subject to Her Majesty's approval:—

Lieutenant William Bowman Seton, Staff Corps, 12th March 1874.

Roll of an Officer of the Staff Corps whose Service entitles him to Promotion.

Rank and Name.	Former Corps.	Date of First Commission.	Date of Present Rank.	Date on which Entitled to Promotion.	To what Rank.	Remarks.
Lieutenant William Bowman Seton.	General list.	12th March 1862.	16th July 1864.	12th March 1874.	Brevet Capt.	

Military Department, Fort William (No. 30 $\frac{\text{Appointment}}{\text{Promotion}}$, dated the 1st May 1874).

To the Adjutant-General, with a request that the Commander-in-Chief may be moved to state whether His Excellency concurs in the opinion of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay army, which appears to be correct, as all Lieutenants have now been promoted either to the substantive or brevet rank of Captain.

Return requested.

By order,
(Signed) B. E. Bacon, Colonel,
Deputy Secretary to the Government of India.

[**No. 965.**] From Colonel T. Rattray, C.B., C.S.I., Officiating Deputy Adjutant-General, to Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department (No. 1490A., Officers'—Promotions dated Simla, the 3rd June 1874).

In returning Military Department docket No. 30 of the 1st ultimo, and the enclosures received therewith, I am directed to state, for the information of Government, that the Commander-in-Chief in India considers that His Excellency Sir A. Spencer's view of the question is correct, viz., that in accordance with paragraph 71 of G.G.O., No. 632 of 1864, promotion of Staff Corps Officers to the brevet rank of Captain should now cease, all the Lieutenants on the Indian General List or Cadres having obtained the rank of Captain.

[**No. 966.**] From Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Military Department (No. 764 $\frac{\text{Appointment}}{\text{Promotion}}$, dated Fort William the 13th June 1874.

With reference to your letter No. 1427 of the 14th April 1874, submitting the question as regards the promotion of Lieutenant W. B. Seton, Staff Corps, to the brevet rank of Captain with reference to paragraph 71 of Government General Order No. 632* of 1864, I am directed to acquaint you for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, that the Government of India concurs with the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief in India, in considering that His Excellency Sir A. Spencer's view of the question is correct, viz., that, in accordance with the paragraph above cited, promotion of Staff Corps Officers to the brevet rank of Captain should now cease, all the Lieutenants on the Indian General List or cadres having obtained the rank of Captain, either substantively or by brevet.

Republished in Bombay G.O., No. 359 of 1864.

No. 765.

Copy of the foregoing forwarded to the Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George, Military Department, for the information of the Right Honourable the Governor in Council.

Extract—Fort William, Military Consultation for September 1874.

[**No. 1642.**] From Colonel J. Macdonald, Secretary to Government, Bombay, Military Department, to Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department,—(No. 3371, dated Bombay Castle the 9th September 1874).

Referring to your letter No, 764, dated 13th June 1874 ($\frac{\text{Appointment}}{\text{Promotion}}$), I am directed to forward the accompanying copy of one from the Adjutant-General, No. 1101, dated 21st August 1874, and of its enclosure, and to solicit the decision of the Government of India on the question therein raised whether, under para. 70 of G. O. G. I. No. 632 of 1864, the grant of the local rank of Captain to Lieutenants of the British service should not cease.

From Brigadier-General C. T. Aitchison, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Secretary to Government, Bombay, Military Department,—No. 1101, dated Poona, the 21st August 1874).

With reference to Government Resolution No. 2357, 24th June 1874, in which the Government of India have ruled that, in accordance with paragraph 71 of G. G. O. No. 379 of 1874, the promotion of Staff Corps Lieutenant to the brevet rank of Captain shall cease, I am directed to state that when Lieutenant Seton's case was submitted to Government with letter from this department, No. 6, 31st March, it was thought that under paragraph 70 of the above quoted order, the local rank of British Officers would cease at the same time as the brevet rank of Staff Corps and local Officers, the object of the local rank being to prevent the supersession of British Officers by the brevet conferred on Indian Officers for length of service.

2. In G. O. C.* by the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief in India, dated 17th July, the local rank of Captain is assigned to Lieutenant Firebrace, Royal Artillery, who is serving in the same station as Lieutenant (now Captain) Seton; and as there appears to be some misapprehension as the interpretation of the order of 1864, the Commander-in-Chief desires me to submit the case for the consideration of Government, for, if it be deemed expedient to retain the local rank of Captain to Officers of the British service to prevent their supersession by Captains in the Staff Corps, it is thought that officers of the Staff Corps situated as Lieutenant Seton is, on completing 12 years' service, should be allowed the same advantage.

* Extract attached.

Extract from General Orders by the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief in India, dated Adjutant-General's Office, Simla, 17th July 1874.

Local rank is assigned to the under-mentioned officers :—

* * * *

Royal Artillery. * *

Lieutenant G. Firebrace to be Captain from the 25th June 1874.

(True extract.)
(Signed) A. Wardrop, Major,
Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army.

[**No. 1643.**] From Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the Adjutant-General,—(No. 1379, $\frac{\text{Appointments}}{\text{Promotions}}$, dated Fort William, the 24th September 1874.)

With reference to your letter, No. 1490A. "Officers"—Promotions," dated the 3rd June 1874, I am directed to forward a further reference in original from the Government of Bombay, No. 3371,* dated 9th September 1874, and enclosure, and to state, for the information of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that the Government of India concur in the view of that Government in considering that, in accordance with paragraph 70 of Government General Order No. 632 of 1864, promotion in the British service of officers to the brevet rank of Captain should also cease, and to request that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief may be moved to favour Government with an expression of his opinion on the subject.

2. Should His Lordship concur in the above view, he will doubtless cause the needful communications to be made to their Excellencies the Commanders-in-Chief of the Madras and Bombay armies.

* To be returned.

Extract—Fort William, Military Consultation for January 1875.

[**No. 1355.**] From Colonel T. Rattray, C.B., C.S.I., for Adjutant-General in India to Colonel H. K. Burne, Secretary to the Government of India Military Department—(No. 3214A, $\frac{\text{Officers'}}{\text{Promotion}}$, dated Head-quarters, Simla, the 16th November 1874.)

With reference to Military Department letter* No. 1379 of 24th September 1874, the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief in India directs me to state that—

1. The brevet rank of Captain which dated from 1816, and was conferred on subaltern Officers of 15 years' service, whether of the British or Indian Army, ceased in 1864.

2. Local rank in the British service is conferred by the Commander-in-Chief in India in virtue of the authority received by His Excellency from Her Majesty through His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief,

* "Appointments—Promotion."

and cannot be discontinued without Her Majesty's distinct command.

3. This authority dates from 1864, and was given under the following circumstances :—

The formation of the Staff Corps in 1861, and supersession by the Officers of the Indian Army admitted to it, of those who were not considered at that time eligible for admission, created discontent, and as a palliative the Officers who were superseded were in 1864 given brevet rank, and thus as a body the Officers of the Indian Service superseded those of the Home Army in India.

The Commander-in-Chief in India at that time represented the position of the British Service Officers to the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, and His Royal Highness, from Her Majesty, empowered His Excellency to confer local rank on the Officers of the Home Army in India, on completion of the same period of service as the Staff Corps Officers received substantive rank, and the Indian Army Officers brevet promotion, viz. :—

Lieutenants	of 12 years'	service to be	Captain.
Captains	„ 20	ditto	Major.
Majors	26	ditto	Lieutenant-Colonel.
Lieut.-Col.	„ 31	ditto	Colonel.

4. In 1866 the Staff Corps was thrown open to the Officers of the Indian Army generally, who on admission received substantive promotion. Those who preferred to remain local benefitted by the steps of Officers who had passed into the Staff Corps. So rapid indeed was the promotion of some individuals to field rank, that one Officer actually became a substantive Lieutenant-Colonel in 13 years, and the Staff Corps Officers in their turn considered themselves superseded by the local Officers of the Infantry cadres.

5. The Officers of the Indian Cavalry cadres who enjoyed superior advantages in pay to the Staff Corps Officers, but whose cadre promotion was very slow, received brevet rank.

6. It will thus be observed that the origin of existing local rank in the British Service in India was due to the formation of the Staff Corps; therefore while the Staff Corps exist His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India is not prepared to concur in the suggestion for the abolition of local rank to Officers of the Home Army serving in India.

7. On reference to paragraph 70 of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, letter No. 194 of 17th June 1864, published in G. G. O. No. 632 of 1864, it will be observed that the local rank conferred on Officers of the British Army serving in India, is entirely distinct from the brevet rank referred to in paragraph 71 of that despatch, and which on the grade of Lieutenant becoming extinct in the Indian Army was no longer to be maintained in the Staff Corps.

8. In conclusion, I am to point out, with reference to the application of paragraph 71, that such Officers of the Staff Corps who may have exchanged into it, or entered it, with more than six years' regimental service, and whose leaves of absence may have reduced their period of Staff Corps service below the four years' necessary to qualify for substantive rank of Captain, must, unless protected by the brevet rank now in operation, be superseded in Army rank by all Officers of the British Service and Staff Corps who have obtained local or substantive promotion.

[**No. 1356.**] From Colonel H. K. BURNE, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the ADJUTANT-GENERAL (No. 897, $\frac{\text{Appointments}}{\text{Promotions}}$, dated Fort William, the 18th January 1875).

WITH reference to your letter No. 3214 A, $\frac{\text{Officers'}}{\text{Promotion}}$, dated the 16th November 1874, I am directed to acquaint you for the information of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that the question whether with reference to paragraphs 69 and 70 of G. G. O. No. 632 of 1864, promotion of Officers of the British Service to the brevet rank of Captain after 12 years' service should not now cease, will be referred for the decision of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

No. 898.

Copy of the above forwarded to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Military Department, with reference to his letter No. 3371, dated 9th September 1874, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

Examined, J. Kennedy.

(The following letters are part of the previous correspondence which has passed between the India Office and the War Office on this subject.)

$\frac{1191}{256\ H.}$

To the MILITARY SECRETARY, Horse Guards.

SIR, India Office, London, April 30th, 1864.

PARA. 1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to forward, for the information of His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, a copy of a Report of the Royal Commission lately appointed to consider the Memorials of Indian Officers complaining of the measures lately adopted for the reduction and reorganization of the Army in that country.

2. His Royal Highness is aware that complaints were made by officers of the Indian Army that such measures were a departure from the assurances contained in certain clauses of the Acts 21 & 22 Vict., cap., 106., sec. 56, and 23 & 24 Vict., cap. 100.

3. Her Majesty's Government considered that these representations deserved serious attention and inquiry, and they therefore recommended to Her Majesty that a Commission should be formed to consider and report whether the Parliamentary guarantee had in any respect been violated by the measures complained of.

4. His Royal Highness, on perusing the Report, will observe that the Commissioners have bestowed much care and attention on the subject. They have, in their Report, classed the different subjects of complaint under 13 different heads, and out of those 13 have given their opinion that in eight the assurances of Parliament have not been departed from; that on two others it is hardly possible to arrive at any conclusion; but that three of the complaints are well founded.

5. These three are—

1st. The supersession in rank of regimental Officers by the more rapid promotion of their brother Officers under the Staff Corps rules.

2nd. The retention on the cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments; and

3rd. The arrangements laid down in the Royal Warrant of the 1st January 1862 (as far as they affect the Officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army of date subsequent to the 17th February 1861), for promotion to the rank of General Officer.

6. On two, and these the most material of these points, the Commission are unanimous, and, without reference to the opinions which may be entertained by Her Majesty's Government, Sir Charles Wood is prepared to accept the opinion of the Commission on these points.

7. Sir Charles Wood has carefully considered in Council the various measures which have been suggested, by which the complaints of the Indian Officers, in these respects, may, as far as possible, be met and remedied, and I am desired to request you to lay before His Royal Highness the measures which appear to the Secretary of State in Council to be best adapted for this purpose, and to solicit the advice and assistance of His Royal Highness in arriving at a decision upon these important questions, which, indeed, involve to some extent, the interests and position of officers of the Line.

8. Sir Charles Wood will first advert to the recommendation of the Commission, that the names of Officers who have been transferred from the regiments of Native Cavalry or Infantry to the new Line regiments should be removed from the cadres of those regiments, and promotions be made in their room.

9. Two of the Commissioners have dissented from this recommendation as being inconsistent with the principles laid down in their Report. In this opinion Sir Charles Wood concurs, but in deference to the Commission he is prepared to adopt their recommendation, and to make immediately such promotions in the cadres of the Native regiments, including the cadres of the 4th and 5th Regiments of European Cavalry, and of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Regiments of European Infantry in Bengal, which were formed from Native regiments.

10. With regard to the amalgamation of the list of Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry by which it is stated that the advancement of the Indian Officers to the rank of General Officers has been retarded, Sir Charles Wood can see no remedy for this complaint but to cancel the regulation for the formation of the Amalgamated List, the Officers of the Indian Army being left to rise, as heretofore, upon their respective lists.

11. Sir Charles Wood observes that there are two other classes of Colonels, late of the Indian Army, affected by that Warrant:—

1. Those of the Artillery and Engineers, lately transferred to Her Majesty's Service.
2. Those of the Staff Corps.

12. With regard to the Officers of Artillery and Engineers, the Commissioners report that they are unable to say whether there has or has not been a violation of the Parliamentary assurance, with reference to the prospect which such of them as were not Colonels before the amalgamation would have of becoming General Officers, but that ultimately the change will be to a very small extent beneficial to the Ordnance Corps.

Upon further consideration, however, of the position of these Officers, Sir Charles Wood is of opinion, that, whilst it is not advisable to leave them on the Amalgamated Lists of Artillery and Engineers, as is provided by the existing Warrants, it is very desirable that a period should be fixed for removing the Officers of the late Indian Artillery and Engineers, which have been now united with the Royal Artillery and Engineers, from the General List of the Indian Army. Sir Charles Wood therefore proposes that, leaving all Colonels of Artillery and Engineers, who have attained that rank previously to the 18th February 1861, to rise to the rank of Major-General on the General List of the Indian Army as heretofore, and is as provided for in the present arrangement, as soon as the last of such Colonels has attained the rank of Major-General, a separate establishment of General Officers of Artillery, 26 in number, shall be formed for the three Indian Corps, and a separate list shall be made of the Officers of such Corps, from which the Colonels of Artillery of the three Corps shall rise by seniority on such list to the rank of Major-General.

When all the Officers of the Indian Artillery have risen to the rank of Major-General, the 26 Generals on the separate Indian Establishment are to be transferred to the establishment of the General Officers of the Royal Artillery which will be agumented by that number, and thenceforward promotions will be made in that Corps on vacancies in the establishment of General Officers so augmented.

A similar course will be adopted as regards the Engineers of the Indian Army, the number of General Officers of that Corps being fixed at 12.

If, at the time of forming such establishments, the number of General Officers of either arm of the Indian Army shall be above the regulated number, the supernumeraries shall be gradually reduced by promoting only two Officers for every three vacancies. If it shall be below the regulated number, the requisite number of Colonels shall be promoted to complete the establishment.

13. With respect to the Officers of the Staff Corps, Sir Charles Wood is of opinion that, as they now belong to a Corps of Her Majesty's general Army, they should be placed, at as early a date as possible, on the same list with the Officers of that Army generally. It appears, however, that if this was carried into effect under the present Warrant, the promotion of the older Officers of the Staff Corps would be retarded, and, in order to obviate this, Sir Charles Wood would suggest that the amalgamation should only apply to Colonels of the Staff Corps who had not attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Army previously to the 18th February 1861.

14. When this amalgamation comes into operation, it will be necessary to make an addition to the establishment of General Officers of the British Army, in order to provide for the due promotion of the additional Officers of the Staff Corps, a corresponding reduction being made in the establishment of General Officers of the Indian Army.

15. The proportion of General Officers to the whole number of combatant Officers af the British Army is 1 in 28, and Sir Charles Wood would suggest therefore that the establishment of the General Officers of the British Army should be gradually augmented to the extent of 1 in 28 of the aggregate strength of the Staff Corps of the three Presidencies, and that the simplest mode of carrying out such addition and reduction gradually and contemporaneously would appear to be, that as soon as the youngest of the Colonels of the Staff Corps, who attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel previously to the 18th February 1861, shall have attained the rank of Major-General, all the General Officers on the list of the Indian Army who are Officers of the Staff Corps shall be transferred to the list of General Officers of the British Army, a corresponding reduction being made in the establishment of General Officers of the Indian Army, and that thenceforward, whenever a Colonel of the Staff Corps on the amalgamated list would, if he had remained on the Indian graduation list, have attained the rank of Major-General, the name of such Officer shall be removed fromthe Indian list, and a promotion made on the amalgamated list, the former establishment being thus reduced, the latter increased by one, until the two establishments of General Officers have reached their proper proportions.

At the same time that the General Officers of the Staff Corps are transferred as above mentioned, all other Officers of the Staff Corps will be placed on a general list for promotion with the Officers of the British Army, and the Colonels on that list will rise indiscriminately to the augmented establishment of General Officers.

16. If His Royal Highness should concur in these views Sir Charles Wood would propose that it should be submitted to Her Majesty that the Warrant of the 1st January 1862 should be cancelled, and that a new Warrant should be issued, regulating the establishment of General Officers of the British and Indian Armies, and also the promotion to the rank of General Officer of the Officers of the Staff Corps.

17. It seems to Sir Charles Wood that the remaining case in which it is reported that the Parliamentary guarantee has been departed from, viz., the supersession in rank occasioned by the extensive promotion made under the Staff Corps Rules, is the only one that presents any serious difficulty.

18. It is evident that a complete remedy for this complaint of supersession in rank must be found either by cancelling the Royal Warrant of 16th January 1861, as is proposed in the case of the Warrant for the amalgamation of the General Officers, and withdrawing the promotion in rank given under that Warrant to the Staff Corps Officers, or by giving such promotion to the Officers of the Indian Army as shall restore them to the relative position as regards the Staff Corps Officers which they held before the formation of those Corps.

19. Sir Charles Wood is very reluctant to adopt the first of these two courses. It would necessarily be attended with much embarrassment and disappointment to a very large class of most deserving Officers, while the replacing of those Officers in their cadres would not be without its disadvantages even to the complainants themselves, and Sir Charles Wood believes that such an extensive cancelling of promotion, which has been enjoyed for two or three years is unprecedented in the Army.

20. On the other hand, to give to all the Officers of the Indian Army such substantive rank as would neutralize the promotion lately given to Officers of the Staff Corps would be a measure attended with a large and heavy expense, is quite uncalled for with any view to the requirements of the public service, and could only be carried out by a departure from the principle of regimental rise, involving a disturbance of the present system of promotion much greater than has been caused by any measures yet adopted.

21. In addition to this, Sir Charles Wood apprehends that such a measure would give to the Officers of the Indian Army an advantage over those of the Line which is not to be justified by the occasion.

22. It appears, however, to Sir Charles Wood, that this case might be met by extending a system of giving rank which has for many years obtained in India. At present, the brevet rank of Captain is given to a subaltern of the Indian Army after 15 years' standing, and the local rank of Captain is given after the same period to a subaltern of the Line, and it was at one time strongly urged by the Government, and the Commander-in-Chief in India, to apply the same principle to promotion to the rank of Major.

By shortening the period after which such rank is given to subalterns, to that fixed for promotion to the rank of Captain in the Staff Corps, and by extending a similar principle to promotion to the higher grades, the supersession by the Officers of the Staff Corps would be completely avoided.

23. There might, perhaps, be some inconvenience in the event of Officers of the Line serving with Officers of the Indian Army, in places to which the local rank given to the former in India did not extend, but Sir Charles Wood apprehends that such instances would be very rare, and might be provided for without difficulty by conferring in each case local rank at such places on the Officers of the Line.

24. The following is the rule which Sir Charles Wood proposes to introduce, the periods of service for promotion being those already laid down for the Staff Corps:

All Officers of the Indian Army, and of the several Staff Corps, whose first commissions bear date on or before the 18th February 1849, to be promoted to the rank of Captain by brevet.

All Officers whose first commissions bear date on or prior to 18th February 1841, to be promoted to the rank of Major by brevet, and all Officers whose first commissions bear date on or prior to the 18th February 1835 to be promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel by brevet.

All such promotions to bear date 18th February 1861.

From and after the 18th February 1861, Officers of the several Staff Corps and of Her Majesty's Indian Army to be promoted by brevet under the following rules:—

After 12 years standing in the Army to be Captains.
„ 20 „ „ „ Majors.
„ 26 „ „ „ Lieutenant-colonels.

On and after 18th February 1866, all Officers who have served thirty-one years on full pay, five of which shall have been in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel, to be promoted to the rank of Colonel by brevet.

25. Officers of the British Army serving in India, including the Ordnance Corps, to have Army local rank in India conferred upon them after precisely the same periods of service and under the same rules, special provision being also made in cases where Line and Indian Officers may serve together elsewhere.

26. It is proposed that the system of promotion to brevet and local rank now introduced should cease in its application to the several grades of the Army on the extinction of those grades among the Officers of the Indian Army.

27. The effect of this measure, which makes the promotion of Officers of the Indian Army and of the Staff Corps dependent upon one and the same rule, will be to neutralize, as respects Army rank, the accelerated promotion given by the Staff Corps regulations, while the local rank given under the same rules to Officers of the British Army would provide against their supersession in rank when serving with Officers of the Indian Army.

28. The above measures, if, after being approved by His Royal Highness, they should be adopted, will, as Sir Charles Wood believes, afford as complete a remedy as is possible in the existing state of matters for the complaints which have been reported to be well founded by the Royal Commission, but, while it may be impossible to place every individual officer in the same situation as if no reduction or change in the Indian Army had taken place, Sir Charles Wood is most anxious to adopt every practicable measure for improving the condition of the Indian Officers generally. Certain measures have already been introduced for that purpose, but he would propose to adopt one further measure, by which their position and prospects will be greatly improved, and in such a manner as to give the benefit generally and equally throughout the Army.

29. His Royal Highness will observe that one of the principal complaints made by the Officers of the Indian Army related to the retention on the cadres of regiments of the names of Officers who had joined the several Staff Corps.

30. The Commission do not consider that arrangement, necessary as it was from the circumstances of the case, to have been an infringement of the Parliamentary guarantee.

31. Irrespective of the very great expense which would have been involved in the opposite course,—that of removing those names and making promotion in their place,—a serious objection presented itself in the very unequal promotion that would have been given in different regiments.

32. The latter objection does not apply to the removal of such names when occupying, on the list of the Indian Army, a place above that of Major, and Sir Charles Wood, being desirous of removing all ground of complaint from the Officers of the Indian Army,—among whom the rate of promotion, accelerated as it has been to a considerable extent by the late retirement of about 300 Officers, is not yet so rapid as that of the Officers of the British Army,—proposes to rule that the names of all Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line regiments on the list of the Indian Army who have come or may come into the position of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel on that list, shall be struck out, and that promotion shall be made in their places.

33. Such an arrangement must necessarily give considerable impetus to promotion and cannot fail to place the whole of the Officers of the Indian Army in a far better position in respect of promotion than they would have been had no occasion arisen for the introduction of the late changes in that service.

34. I am to request that Sir Charles Wood may be favoured, at as early a date as is convenient to His Royal Highness, with an expression of His Royal Highness's opinion upon the measures here proposed; and Sir Charles Wood will be extremely gratified if His Royal Highness should concur in the propriety of the proposed arrangements.

I have, &c.
(Signed) T. T. Pears,
Major-General, Military Secretary.

Sir, Horse Guards, May 20th, 1864.

I am directed by the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief to acknowledge the receipt of this day of your letter dated 30th ultimo, forwarding a copy of the report of the Royal Commission lately appointed to consider the memorials of Indian Officers complaining of certain measures which have been adopted for the reduction and reorganization of the Army in that country, as infringing the assurances of certain clauses of the acts, cap. 106 of 21 & 22 Vict., and cap. 100 of 23 & 24 Vict.

His Royal Highness avails himself of this opportunity of testifying to the care and attention which the Commissioners have bestowed on the subject of their inquiry, and to the great cordiality with which Sir Charles Wood has entered with His Royal Highness into the fullest explanation and discussion of the measures proposed to meet and remedy the complaints of the Indian Officers, in reference both to the general benefit of the service and to their bearing upon the interests of Officers of the various branches of the British Army.

After very careful consideration of every part of the subject, His Royal Highness has approved of the proposals contained in your letter, and I am commanded to request you to communicate his concurrence to the Secretary of State for India in Council.

I have, &c.
The Under Secretary of State, W. F. Foster.
&c. &c. &c.
War Office.

Officers Promoted to the Rank of Major for Distinguished Service in the Field.

My Lord, March 4th, 1875.

I have the honour to transmit to you, to be laid before the Royal Commission on Army Promotion, the inclosed memorandum on the present position of the distinguished service majors.

I am, &c.
Gathorne Hardy.

The Right Hon. Lord Penzance.

Memorandum on the Present Position of the Distinguished Service Majors.

System which existed prior to the changes made in 1854.

1. In order to understand this question, it is necessary to give a slight sketch of the system of promotion which existed in the army, before it was changed by the Royal Commissions of 1854 and 1858. This system had been in force for many years, including the wars at the end of the last century and the early part of the present, down to 1854. A Royal Commission inquired into the promotion and retirement in the army in 1840, but no change was then made, and it was until 1854, at the commencement of the Crimean war, that changes were introduced, the result of which entirely prevented the advancement of the distinguished service majors.

Promotion from lieut.-colonel upwards.

2. The system of promotion prior to 1854 was one of strict seniority, from the rank of lieutenant-colonel upwards, so that when an officer obtained that rank, no one, except by the very rare opportunity of aide-de-camp to the Sovereign, could pass over his head. There was no fixed establishment of general officers, their numbers varied from time to time according to the frequency or otherwise of general brevets. These brevets were the only means by which the lieutenant-colonel was advanced to the rank of colonel; the colonel to major-general, and so on to the rank of general. This system moved up all alike, whether distinguished or otherwise, or on full or half pay; and it had this great advantage for the distinguished service majors, that when they arrived at the rank of lieutenant-colonel no one could pass over them and they were sure of advancement to the higher ranks in a reasonable time. That system made the rank of lieutenant-colonel, the "all in all" for an officer to obtain, who was anxious for advancement in his profession.

Promotion up to lieut.-colonel.

3. The system of promotion below the rank of lieutenant-colonel was regimental, but any captain might be rewarded with the rank of major; or any major with that of lieu-

tenant-colonel for service in the field. When once a captain became major he had an assured position in the army that must lead him in course of time to the highest rank; although while he held the rank of major he was passed over by a considerable number of majors who became lieutenant-colonels of regiments, but eventually he was promoted to lieutenant by general brevet. As an example of this may be cited the case of the late Lieutenant-General J. Gratian, C.B., colonel of the 17th Regiment, who was promoted a major on the 26th of May 1841, for services in the Chinese war of 1840. He became lieutenant-colonel by the general brevet of 1846, colonel in 1854, and major-general in 1861; being only 20 years from major to major-general.

Royal Commission of 1854.

4. In accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1854, general brevets were discontinued; a fixed establishment of general officers was created; and promotion among them, and from colonel to major-general, was to go by seniority on a death vacancy occurring. It was recommended that lieutenant-colonels should only rise to the rank of colonel after the performance of a qualifying service of three years in command of a regiment, or as lieutenant-colonels of artillery and engineers, or by holding a high position on the staff for that time. Majors were to be promoted to lieutenant-colonels, and captains to majors on a death vacancy among the general officers on the fixed establishment, so that the death of a general promoted the senior lieutenant-general, major-general, colonel, major, and captain; but the *lieutenant-colonel* could only become a colonel by complying with the conditions mentioned above.

The Commission further recommended that promotion to "field rank for merit in the field," should be by brevet, as formerly, in order that the officer "might not be deprived of regimental employment," but that such brevet rank should be converted into regimental rank at the earliest consequent opportunity.

This is a summary of the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1854 affecting promotion, and a Royal Warrant of the same year gave effect to them.

Vide Report of R.C. 1854, par. 44.

5. The advantages which the Royal Commission expected to obtain, were:—

1. By the abolition of general brevets of the substitution of the qualifying service for the rank of colonel; that it would be impossible for an officer who had "obtained the brevet rank of lieutenant-"colonel without having performed any duty in that "rank, remaining for many years on half pay, and ultimately becoming a major-general."

Do. par. 40.

2. To give such facilities to young officers to become colonels that the Sovereign should have a wide field for the selection of officers, properly qualified "by "their age, their vigour of body, and their pro-"fessional knowledge and ability," for important commands.

R.C. of 1854 did not intend by its changes to destroy the future prospect of the D.S. major.

6. A careful perusal of the Report of this Royal Commission leads to the conclusion, that it had no intention of throwing impediments in the way of future advancement of officers promoted for merit in the field; but rather that it wished to give them greater facilities for promotion than previously existed; for which purpose it recommended that in place of brevet rank bonâ fide regimental rank should be given. Further, that they never conceived the possibility of an officer promoted to the rank of major for distinguished service gradually working his way to the top of the list of lieutenant-colonels and *remaining there for* 8, 10, 15, or perhaps 20 *years*, while his juniors (in consequence of their recommendations) were daily passing over him.

W.O. memo. May 1st 1855.

7. The next change in the system of promotion was by War Office Memorandum, May 1st, 1855, directing "Her "Majesty has been graciously pleased to approve of the "rank of colonel being given to officers who obtain the "rank of brevet lieutenant-colonel for service in the field "after the period of six years' actual service with that "rank; and that they may at once have the option of a "step of substantive unattached rank where the con-"venience of the service will admit of it."

R.C. of 1858.

8. The changes made by the Royal Commission of 1854 not having been found to work well in practice, the subject was reconsidered in 1858 by a second Royal Commission, which recommended:—

Vide Report of R.C. of 1858, pars. 80 and 81.

1. That the qualifying term of three years, for a lieutenant-colonel to become a colonel, should be extended to five years.

Do. par. 7.

2. That the qualifying term of brevet lieutenant-colonels promoted for service in the field, authorised by War Office Memorandum, 1st May, 1855 (quoted above), should be eight instead of six years.

Do. pars. 71 and 87.

3. That the privilege of converting brevet rank, obtained for service in the field, into substantive rank, should be discontinued, except in rare and exceptional cases.

These recommendations were given effect to in the Royal Warrant of the 14th October 1858.

Vide Report R.C. of 1858, pars. 64 to 71 and App. 22, p. 60.

9. This Commission of 1858 had to meet the objection raised by the Treasury of the great increase to the half-pay list, occasioned by the number of officers who converted their brevet rank, obtained for service in the Crimea, into substantive rank, which necessitated their going on half pay. Great difficulty was also found in bringing them back to full pay. A memorandum drawn up by the Horse Guards for the Commission, enters fully into these difficulties. It says, with reference to the principles of converting brevet rank, that the Commissioners of 1854 intended that it should apply only to rare and exceptional cases, and not to the numbers who were rewarded with brevet rank for the Crimea. In withdrawing this privilege they could hardly have intended that the rank of major conferred for service in the field *should carry with it no permanent advantage whatever*, as prior to 1854 very considerable advantages were attached to it, and against which no objection was ever urged.

10. This memorandum then draws a comparison between the number of officers who received brevet promotion, for the battles and sieges between 1811 and 1815, and those who received it for the war against Russia 1854–6. In the former, 383 promotions were given, against 464 for the latter. It is, however, notorious that the junior officers of the army were not very liberally rewarded for their services during the first mentioned period. The number of majors promoted for distinguished service during the Russian war may not be considered excessive, when the strength of the British troops engaged is taken into account; and besides the battles, the siege of Sebastopol, lasting for 11 months, afforded junior officers more frequent opportunities of distinction than occur in general actions. In the suppression of the Indian mutiny a very large force was employed, divided into numerous detached columns, which also gave officers great chances of distinction.

Vide Report of R.C. 1858, par.

11. The Royal Commissioners at paragraph 72 of their report state that: "in ordinary cases, the advantages of "brevet promotion will be confined to the privileges, and "in the case of majors, to the additional pay which have "always attached to brevet rank." While a regimental major receives 4*s.* 5*d.* a day more than a captain and forage allowance, the additional pay of a major promoted for "merit in the field" is 2*s.* a day, and forage allowance for one horse *when doing field officer's duty in a garrison*. This latter advantage is a very doubtful one, as on account of the frequent change of stations, in many of which there is no garrison duty to perform, the officer has to be constantly buying and selling horses, generally at a loss. The privilege of converting brevet into substantive rank has almost entirely been withdrawn, and there has hardly been an instance of it since 1858; and at the same time no provision was made for the future advancement of the distinguished service majors when they rose to the top of the list of lieutenant-colonels.

Present system of promotion in the higher ranks.

12. The system of promotion in the higher ranks of the army is now the same as in 1858. The abolition of purchase has not in any way affected this question. Captains who obtain the rank of major for service in the field, are promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel in due course by death vacancies among the fixed establishment of general officers. This period has varied lately from 10 to nearly 12 years. They cannot, however, rise above the rank of lieutenant-colonel until they have qualifying posts for five years; and as they only arrive at these posts by regimental promotion, their brevet rank gives them no *permanent* advantage, and they find themselves on becoming colonels in the same position as if they had never been promoted for distinguished service. This arises from the changes introduced by the above-mentioned Royal Commissions.

13. It has been shown (*vide* paragraphs 7 and 8) that a captain and brevet major who receives the rank of lieutenant-colonel for service in the field, as with a major who has obtained his rank by seniority, qualifies for the rank of colonel, after eight years' actual service in that rank; but no such loophole has been left open for a captain who has been promoted to the rank of a major for distinguished service, on his attaining by seniority the brevet rank of lieutenant-colonel.

14. The following table gives the number of officers promoted to the rank of major, in each of the principal brevets, for services in the war against Russia, and in the Indian mutiny; with the number who were still lieutenant-colonels on full pay on the 1st June 1874:—

Battles, &c.	Dates of Brevets.	Number promoted Major.	Still Lieut.-Colonel.
Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman	12 Dec. 1854	1	3
Attack on the quarries and services during the siege.	17 July 1855		0
Capture of Sebastopol and services during the siege.	2 Nov. 1855	150	19
Services during the war	6 June 1856	77	8
Siege and capture of Delhi	19 Jan. 1858	26	2
Defence of Lucknow and its relief by Lord Clyde.	24 Mar. 1858	32	4
Capture of Lucknow and campaigns in Central India.	20 July 1858	39	9
Concluding campaigns in Oude, Central India, &c.	26 April 1859	19	6
	Total	512	51

A considerable number of these 512 were subsequently killed or died, while others received the rank of lieutenant-colonel for further services, and consequently became colonels eight years afterwards. Besides these 512, some subalterns were afterwards rewarded with the rank of major on their becoming captains.

Case of Lieut.-Col. J. Hackett, 76th Regiment.

15. In order to show how the interests of those officers who were promoted majors for service in the field have suffered by the changes which took place in 1854 and 1858, it is necessary to give some instances of the working of the present system. It will be seen from the table above that only three officers of the 143 promoted on the 12th December 1854, are still remaining on full pay with the rank of lieutenant-colonel. The senior of these is Lieutenant-Colonel John Hackett, commanding 76th Regiment. This officer entered the army 17th November 1837, he became lieutenant in 1839, captain 1851, received a certificate from the senior department of the Royal Military College (tantamount to having passed the Staff College of the present day), and was appointed D.A.Q.M. General on the Head Quarter Quarter Staff in the Crimea, and for his services in that capacity "at the affairs of Bulganac and McKenzie's "Farm, and battles of Alma, Inkerman, Balaklava, and "siege of Sebastopol," was promoted brevet major 12th December 1854. He also served in the campaign of 1860 in the North of China as major of the 44th Regiment. His brevet rank was converted into substantive rank on the 7th September 1855, and on the 24th August 1857 he was brought back to full pay as major in the 44th Regiment. The whole of his service of 37 years has been on full pay with the exception of this break of two years. He became lieutenant-colonel by seniority 26th November 1861, and was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the 76th Regiment on the 3rd February 1872, consequently will become full colonel 3rd February 1877, after nearly 40 years' service, $15\frac{2}{12}$ of which as a lieutenant-colonel in the army. For upwards of 10 years all lieutenant-colonels holding qualifying posts have passed over him, including some hundreds from the Indian Army. Many of these latter qualified as second in command of native regiments, a position certainly not superior to that of major of a British regiment, which Lieutenant-Colonel Hackett was for $14\frac{1}{2}$ years; more than 10 of which he was a brevet lieutenant-colonel. The number of colonels who now stand above him in the Army List, and who have passed over him by the operations of these changes since he became a major, is 748.

Cases of Lieut.-Cols. Meredith and Ingilby.

16. The above is not by any means an extreme case, the same will happen to all who are unfortunate in their regimental promotion. The second case is that of Lieutenant-Colonel Meredith, who became lieutenant-colonel 7th March 1862, but this officer has been several years on half pay, part of which was compulsory on the abolition of the depôt battalions in 1870. The third case remaining of the 12th December 1854, is that of Lieutenant-Colonel Ingilby, Royal Artillery, who has 28 years uninterrupted full pay service. He became major 12th December 1854, for services in the Crimean campaign, the affairs of "Bulganac and M'Kenzie's Farm, the "battles of the Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman (severely "wounded), the siege of Sebastopol, and repulse of the "sortie on the 26th October 1854." He became lieutenant-colonel by seniority 9th November 1862, and lieutenant-colonel, Royal Artillery, 17th December 1870, so that he will consequently become colonel 17th December 1875, after 13 years' service as lieutenant-colonel, during eight of which he has been passed over by every qualifying lieutenant-colonel, many of whom have had no war service, and are considerably his junior.

Case of Lieut.-Col. Chads, 65th Regiment.

17. The next case in the Army List is that of Lieutenant-Colonel Chads, now major in the 65th Regiment. His commissions bear date as follows:—Ensign, 12th November 1847; lieutenant, 12th September 1848; captain, 30th June 1854; brevet-major, 15th December 1854; brevet lieutenant-colonel, 9th November 1862.

He received his promotion for distinguished conduct during the Burmese war of 1852–53, conduct which called forth the thanks of the Governor-General of India in Council on six separate occasions. He is now a major in the 65th Regiment, and probably will not become lieutenant-colonel of the regiment for three or four years, and cannot qualify for colonel's rank until 1882, when he will have served 20 years as lieutenant-colonel, and during 15 he will have been constantly passed over.

Case of Lieut.-Col. Hudson G. Guards.

18. The following is the case of an officer who will become a colonel, under the present regulations, in less than 15 years, and without any war service. Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. F. Hudson, Grenadier Guards. His commissions date:—Ensign, 7th November 1862; ensign and lieutenant, 2nd October 1863; lieutenant and captain, 6th July 1867; captain and lieutenant-colonel 3rd August 1872; assistant military secretary, Ceylon, 19th August 1872. This latter is a qualifying appointment, which will make him a colonel in the army on the 12th August 1877, in $14\frac{8}{12}$ years' service, only five of which as a field officer.

Contrast this with the case of Lieutenant-Colonel Hackett, a field officer promoted for merit in the field, who has to serve $15\frac{2}{12}$ years as lieutenant-colonel before he can get the rank of colonel: $10\frac{2}{12}$ of which do not count towards future promotion; or that of Lieutenant-Colonel Chads with 20 years as a lieutenant-colonel, 15 of which do not count. Lieutenant-Colonel Hackett had probably been seven or eight years in the service before Lieutenant-Colonel Hudson was born, and he was actually a lieutenant-colonel in the army a year before the latter entered the service.

19. The writer of this memorandum would not wish to say anything against Lieutenant-Colonel Hudson's good fortune, on the contrary if allowed to express an opinion, it would be that openings of this sort should be afforded to young officers to enable them to rise rapidly in the profession: a dull system of seniority which prevents officers from rising while young to the higher ranks, reduces all to a dead level, and takes away every incentive to exertion. He merely wishes to point out the working of the present system, and to show how it completely stops the advancement of officers who have already gained field rank by merit.

20. There are many other cases that may be cited, but only one as conspicuous, as that of Lieutenant-Colonel Hudson, which is that of Lieutenant-Colonel F. W. G. F. Walker, Scotch Fusilier Guards, assistant military secretary at the Cape of Good Hope, who joined the army in 1862, will become full colonel in 1878, after 16 years' service. It should be noticed that these two officers will go over the heads of nearly all the 51 officers given in the table above.

Average service of officers promoted in regiments.

21. It is unnecessary to give any of the numerous individual cases of rapid promotion in the regiments of infantry, for by a statement E E, page 111, of the Report of the Committee appointed in 1870 to inquire into the promotion and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps, it appears that the mean average service of infantry officers—(in the cavalry promotion is much quicker) in becoming lieutenant-colonel is 23·7 years, and majors 18·1 years, so that the average time of service as a major is 5·6 years. The distinguished service majors pass from 10 to nearly 12 years in that rank. The lieutenant-colonel qualifies in five years, and obtains the rank of colonel in 28·7 years, so that ordinary regimental promotion gives the rank of colonel in 10·6 years after becoming major. Thus of two officers promoted to the rank of major on the same day, the one for merit in the field, the other by ordinary regimental succession, the latter gets the rank of colonel in the same and probably less time, than the former gets the rank of lieutenant-colonel only; *above which he cannot rise.*

Previous inquiry into the subject.

22. The subject of the distinguished service majors has been taken up at different times, but only as regards their promotion from major to lieutenant-colonel. It was first inquired into by Lord de Grey in 1864, but nothing however was then done. In 1867 Sir Charles Russell, Bart., V.C., took it up in the House of Commons, and on the 17th June asked the Secretary of State for War, "Whether "majors promoted for distinguished service will be allowed "brevet rank as lieutenant-colonels after eight years' ser-"vice, as in the case of lieutenant-colonels, who under the "existing Warrant are promoted to the rank of full colonel "after eight years' service?"

To which Sir John Pakington replied, "That this was a "question regulated by Royal Warrant, and he had no "power with regard to the promotion of these officers "beyond what the terms of the Warrant might permit. In "1864 this question was considered by Lord de Grey, who "decided to adhere to the existing terms of the Warrant; "but from inquiries that he had made he was disposed to "think that the subject might fairly be reconsidered, and "he should accordingly give it his best attention."

In the next session Sir Charles Russell put a second question, and asked, "Whether after the consideration he "had been able to give the question, he is prepared to "place the distinguished service majors on the same "footing with regard to promotion as the distinguished "service lieutenant-colonels?" In reply to which Sir John Pakington said, "I am afraid, sir, that I shall not be able to put the distinguished service majors to whom my gallant friend has referred on the same footing as lieutenant-colonels. I hope, however, to make a concession "to these distinguished officers which will be satisfactory "to them; but I cannot state at present the exact mode "in which it will be done."

Concession granted by Sir John Pakington.

23. It will be seen from this that the only question then raised was the promotion to major to lieutenant-colonel. It was evident that the great number of majors on the list, would make it impossible to obtain the rank of lieutenant-colonel under 15 years at least. To meet this Sir John Pakington conceded that when a batch of officers who had been promoted on the same day, came to the top of the list, they should all be promoted on the first vacancy. *This was not made retrospective, and only came into operation on the 1st January* 1868, when the majors of the 6th June 1856 were promoted lieutenant-colonels after 11½ years' service. At present it takes 10 years to become lieutenant-colonel. Had it been made retrospective to the date of the Warrant of 1854 it would have included the first batch for the Crimean war, viz., the 12th December 1854; the distinguished service majors would have gained the rank of lieutenant-colonel in six or seven years, about the same time that a major becomes a lieutenant-colonel by regimental promotion, as shown in paragraph 21 of this memorandum.

24. This concession of Sir John Pakington's prevented a perfect stagnation in the promotion of all the majors in the army; it was not a concession to the distinguished service more than other majors. The question of their future advancement was not then considered. In 1871 the subject was brought before the authorities at the Horse Guards, but nothing was done.

Anomaly caused by recent Gold Coast promotions.

25. A curious anomaly has taken place in the recent promotions for the Gold Coast. Captains and brevet-majors, C. R. H. Nicholl, and F. E. Sotherby, of the Rifle Brigade, who had obtained the rank of major by seniority for length of service, were promoted lieutenant-colonels for service on the Gold Coast, and as such will qualify in eight years for the rank of colonel. Lieutenant-Colonel Godfrey Clerk, a major in the Rifle Brigade, obtained the rank of major on the 20th of July 1858 for service during the Indian mutiny: he became lieutenant-colonel on the 25th March 1859. He is 14 and 15 years respectively senior to Lieutenant-Colonels Nicholl and Sotherby as a major, but will not begin to qualify for colonel until he becomes lieutenant-colonel of a battalion, the prospect of his doing so being rather remote. He will, consequently, be passed over in the army by these two officers. What makes it still more remarkable is, that they will qualify for colonel while serving under Lieutenant-Colonel G. Clerk in the same regiment. Other similar instances have also occurred.

Anomaly caused by Abyssinian promotions.

26. Another curious anomaly is that two officers of the Royal Artillery, Lieutenant-Colonel L. W. Penn, C.B., and Lieutenant-Colonel J. Hills, V.C., C.B., who served the Abyssinian campaign together; the former as a 1st captain and brevet lieutenant-colonel, and the latter as a 2nd captain and brevet major. Lieutenant-Colonel Penn was promoted to major for services in the Crimea on the 2nd November 1855, and became lieutenant-colonel by seniority on the 20th January 1867. Lieutenant-Colonel Hills was promoted major on the 19th January 1864, $8\frac{2}{12}$ years after Lieutenant-Colonel Penn, for services during the Indian mutiny. When the rewards were distributed for the Abyssinian campaign, Lieutenant-Colonel Penn received a C.B., and Major Hills was promoted lieutenant-colonel, which qualifies him for the rank of colonel in eight years, viz., on the 15th August 1876; but Lieutenant-Colonel Penn does not qualify until he has served five years as a lieutenant-colonel in the Royal Artillery which will be on 1st April 1877, so that Lieutenant-Colonel Hills will pass over him.

Different kinds of qualifications.

27. It is here necessary to point out how different are the qualifications which entitle an officer to succeed to the rank of colonel. Besides the posts of command of a regiment and certain defined positions on the Staff (vide Royal Warrant, 27th December 1870, p. 8, par. 29), a lieutenant-colonel qualifies in five years while employed on the Public Works Department in India, probably performing duties that are purely civil: an instance of this is the case of Lieutenant-Colonel J. R. Maunsell, Royal (late Bombay) Engineers, at present employed in the Public Works Department. His commissions are dated: 2nd lieutenant, 11th June 1853; 1st lieutenant, 1st August 1854; captain, 15th June 1860; major, 5th July 1872; lieutenant-colonel, 11th December 1873. He will become colonel on the 11th December 1878, in $25\frac{6}{12}$ years' service, only $6\frac{5}{12}$ of which will he have been a field officer. For many years he may not have performed any military duty, and five years' service as lieutenant-colonel in a civil department qualifies him for the rank of colonel: whereas Lieutenant-Colonel Chads does not count 15 out of 20 years' military service as a lieutenant-colonel, as shown in paragraph 17 of this memorandum.

Indian Staff Corps.

28. In the Indian Staff Corps promotion goes by length of service; a major becomes a lieutenant-colonel after six years' service as a major; and the lieutenant-colonel of course qualifies in five years, making only 11 years from major to colonel. This will lead in a few years to the Imperial list being entirely swamped by colonels from the Indian army, every one of whom are passing over the distinguished service majors. Of the qualifying posts held by these officers is that of second in command in a native regiment: whereas in the Imperial army, a major of a regiment and with the rank of lieutenant-colonel is not recognised as holding a qualifying appointment.

Case of Lieut.-Col. Teesdale, C.B., V.C., promoted for services as a subaltern.

29. We will now give the case of a subaltern promoted to field rank for distinguished service as a subaltern; it is that of Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel C. C. Teesdale, V.C., C.B., Royal Artillery. The dates of his commissions are 2nd lieutenant, 18th June 1851; 1st lieutenant, 22nd April 1853; captain, 14th January 1858; major, 15th January 1858; lieutenant-colonel, 14th December 1868. Taking the average rate of promotion in the Royal Artillery for the last five years he will not become lieutenant-colonel in the regiment till June 1878, and consequently will not become colonel in the army until June 1883, when he will have served 15 years as a lieutenant-colonel, 10 of which he will have been daily passed over.

He was one of a few Englishmen who, under Sir F. Williams, so materially aided in the defence of Kars. For his services he received the thanks of the English Government, who decorated him with the Companion of the Bath. The French conferred upon him the 4th class of the Legion of Honour, and Turkey gave him the 3rd class of the Medjidie. He also received the Victoria Cross, "for gallant conduct in having, while acting aide-de-camp to Major-General Sir W. Fenwick Williams, Bart., K.C.B., at Kars, volunteered to take command of the force engaged in the defence of the most advanced part of the works, the key of the position, against the attack of the Russian army; when, by throwing himself into the midst of the enemy, who had penetrated into the above redoubt, on the 29th of September 1855, he encouraged the garrison to make an attack so vigorous as to drive out the Russians therefrom, and prevent its capture; also, from having during the hottest part of the action, when the enemy's fire had driven the Turkish artillerymen from their guns, rallied the latter, and by his intrepid example induced them to return to their post; and further, after having led the final charge which completed the victory of the day, for having, at the greatest personal risk, saved from the fury of the Turks a considerable number of the disabled among the enemy, who were lying wounded outside the works, an action witnessed and acknowledged gratefully before the Russian Staff by General Mouravieff.

By the changes made in the system of promotion by the Royal Commissions of 1854 and 1858, Lieutenant-Colonel Teesdale cannot become a colonel in the English Army until he has served 15 years as a lieutenant-colonel, and been passed over by many hundreds of officers who were either captains or lieutenants, and some had even not entered the service when he was promoted to field rank for distinguished service.

30. The subjects of this memorandum have always felt, that on becoming lieutenant-colonels by seniority, they should be placed on the same footing as the distinguished service lieutenant-colonels, and be allowed to qualify in eight years further service, for the rank of colonel. This would prevent such anomalies as those pointed out in paragraphs 25 and 26. No question of expense is involved, and no new principle would be introduced. An addition to paragraph 29, i. Royal Warrant, 27th December 1870, is all that is required, following the words: "Lieutenant-colonel, conferred for distinguished service in the field;" to be added, "*or when the rank of lieutenant-colonel has been obtained by seniority from that of major conferred for distinguished service in the field.*" This would afford a loophole for the slow, but sure advancement of the distinguished service majors, and confer upon them *some permanent benefit* as a reward for their distinguished service, and enable them to maintain *to a certain extent* the position in the army to which they had previously been advanced.

31. The actual effect of such an addition to the above-mentioned Royal Warrant would be that 28 colonels who were originally distinguished service majors, and have served continuously on full pay on the Staff, would have their commissions as colonels antedated an average time of $1\frac{2}{18}$ years.—There are 99 lieutenant-colonels who were also distinguished service majors;—27 would now be entitled to the rank of colonel, and 10 in 1875, 9 in 1876, 13 in 1877, 5 in 1878, 10 in 1879, 10 in 1880, 3 in 1881, 12 in 1882;—47 of these 99 lieutenant-colonels will in any case become colonels within the next five years, as they are holding qualifying appointments; but as all but 9 of the remainder are substantive majors, many of them will become qualifying lieutenant-colonels in a few years.

There are 25 majors who were promoted so that rank for distinguished service in India, New Zealand, Abyssinia, &c., and 31 for the late war on the Gold Coast, but as these latter only received that rank in 1874, there will not be many of them in the service in 1892, the probable date of their completing eight years' service as brevet lieutenant-colonels, to benefit by the proposed addition. No account has been taken in these calculations of the officers of the Indian army, because their general promotion from the rank of major has been much more rapid; for, with the exception of the officers of the late Indian Artillery and Engineers, a few of whom would be entitled to promotion, there are only two lieutenant-colonels in that army who have more than eight years' service in that rank, and these were only seven years as majors.

The Emoluments of Colonels of Cavalry Regiments.

My Lord, War Office, November 8th, 1875.

I have the honour to request that the Royal Commission on the Promotion and Retirement of Officers in the Army will consider the effect, on the prospects of the officers concerned, of the Royal Warrant of the 12th August 1873, reducing the pay of the colonels of cavalry regiments, taken in connexion with the changes in the price, &c. of cavalry commissions since 1859; and that the Commission will state whether, in their opinion, the arrangement now in force with regard to these officers is consistent with their fair claims and the public interest.

I am, &c.

(Signed) Gathorne Hardy.

The Right Honourable
The Lord Penzance.

Actuaries' Report, No. 109.

1. Before the 31st January 1860 the regulation prices of cavalry commissions were higher than the prices of the corresponding infantry commissions; and when an officer of a cavalry regiment went, by exchange, to the full or half-pay of infantry he received from the officer exchanging with him the difference between the cavalry and infantry values of the commissions which he had purchased or earned by service. At that date, the cavalry prices were reduced to infantry rates; and by General Order, No. 753, of 1860, provision was made that the difference between cavalry and infantry rates due to officers on quitting their regiments should be paid from the Military Reserve Fund.

2. The pay of the colonel of a cavalry regiment was 1,350*l.*, and it so remained until the 12th August 1873, when a Royal Warrant [clause 112, Army Circulars, 1873], directed that colonels appointed after the 1st January 1873 should only have 1,000*l.* a year (the infantry rate) if they had received or should receive the difference of value, or should have no difference to receive.

3. Up to the 31st January 1860 when an officer was appointed to a cavalry colonelcy he had to pay whatever "difference" he had at any time received. From that date no such repayment has been required.

4. Cavalry colonels may thus be divided into three classes:—

Class A.—Appointed before 1860, having 1,350*l.* a year, subject to repayment of the "difference."

Class B.—Appointed from 1860 to 1873, having 1,350*l.* a year, and not repaying the difference.

Class C.—Appointed after 1873, having 1,000*l.* a year, and not repaying the difference.

5. Five officers have been appointed colonels of cavalry regiments under the Warrant of 1873, on 1,000*l.* a year; each having at some previous time received the difference, viz. 1,675*l.*

6. If officers who had become lieutenant-colonels of cavalry before the 31st January 1860 and who had not become honorary colonels on the 12th August 1873, had been held to have a vested interest in rewards similar to those which came to Class B., it is obvious that each loses 350*l.* a year from the time of becoming honorary colonel. If, however, they be compared with class A. the loss of 350*l.* a year is reduced by the life annuity which 1,675*l.* (the difference in most cases repayable) would purchase at the age of becoming honorary colonel. Had the vested interest been considered in the same manner as the vested interests of artillery officers in the Warrant of the 5th July 1872, the rates of pay awarded to these five officers would have been:

	As compared with Class A.	As compared with Class B.
	£	£
Sir T. McMahon	1,160	1,350
Sir A. Little	1,178	1,350
Major-General White	1,204	1,350
Major-General Wardlaw	1,193	1,350
Major-General Low	1,193	1,350

7. The officers to whom honorary colonelcies will for some time fall had obtained their regimental lieutenant-colonelcies before the cavalry prices were reduced to infantry rates. The change therefore brings them no gain beyond the non-repayment of the "difference," usually 1,675*l.* As officers who were not lieutenant-colonels in 1860 come up for honorary colonelcies, they will be fairly chargeable at compound interest with the sums saved in the diminished price paid for their commissions. This would form a gradually increasing set-off to the 350*l.* a year lost under the Warrant of 1873.

8. To give each officer at the time of being appointed honorary colonel a sum less than 1,350*l.* by the precise equivalent of his gain under the change of prices in 1860 would be a simple actuarial calculation, provided it were laid down whether Class A. or Class B. should be the standard of comparison.

Denham Robinson.

September 27th, 1875.

Memorandum by the Accountant General of the Army.

As regards emoluments of Cavalry Line Colonels, besides their pay of 1*l.* 12*s.* 10*d.* they received prior to 1833 "non-effective allowance," 20*l.* a year, and "pay of warrant men" 292*l.* (in all 911*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* a year), besides "off reckonings," calculated at 539*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.* a year; total 1,450*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*

The Committee of the House of Commons (1833) recommended that the pay should be fixed at 900*l.* a year, and that the "off reckonings" should remain unaltered.

They stated in their report that the emoluments of the Colonels of the Cavalry should be "about 1,350*l.* a year," which is the amount fixed by the Royal Warrant of 1855, when "off reckonings" were abolished.

John Milton.

30th May, 1876.

INDEX.

NOTE.—References to Foreign Armies are at the end of each section of the Index; the name of the country being printed in Old English type.

References to the Report and Recommendations of the Royal Commission are in **black type.**

LIST OF HEADINGS.

ACCOUNTS.

ADJUTANTS.

AGE.
1. *Generally.*
2. *General Officers.*
3. *Field Officers.*
4. *Lieutenant-Colonels.*
5. *Majors.*
6. *Captains.*
7. *France.*

ANNUITIES.

ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS.
1. *British.*
2. *Foreign.*

Austria.

BATH, ORDER OF.

Belgium.

BONUS.

BREVET-PROMOTION.

BRIGADE DEPÔTS.

CAVALRY.

COLLEGE, MILITARY.

COLONELS.

COLONELCIES OF REGIMENTS.

COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

CONTROL DEPARTMENT.

COST.

DECORATIONS.

Denmark.

DOSSIER.

EDUCATION, MILITARY.

ENGINEERS, ROYAL.

ENTRANCE of OFFICERS for FIRST COMMISSIONS.
1. *Competition.*
2. *Passing a Test.*
3. *Foreign Systems.*

EQUIVALENT ANNUITIES.

EXAMINATIONS, GENERALLY.

EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION.

EXCHANGE.

"FIVE-YEARS' RULE" FOR RETIREMENT.
1. *Generally.*
2. *As applied to Lieutenant-Colonels.*
3. *As applied to Majors.*

FOOT GUARDS.

France.

GENERAL OFFICERS.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Artillery and Engineers.*
3. *Fixed Establishment.*
4. *Grades.*
5. *Half-pay List.*
6. *Honorary Colonels.*
7. *Pay.*
8. *Qualification.*
9. *Retired List.*

Germany.

GOOD SERVICE PENSIONS.

GROS-MAJOR.

HALF-PAY.

Holland.

HONOUR, COURT AND COUNCIL OF.

INDIA, BRIGADES IN.

INDIA, LOCAL RANK IN.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Italy.

LEGION OF HONOUR.

MAJORS.

MEMORIALS OF OFFICERS, ROYAL COMMISSION ON.

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

OFFICERS.

ORGANIZATION.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Corps, Divisions, Brigades.*
3. *Artillery.*
4. *Cavalry.*
5. *Infantry.*

PAY, &c.

PAYMASTERS.

PROMOTION.
1. *Generally.*
2. *By Purchase.*
3. *By Selection.*
4. *By Seniority.*
5. *Unattached.*
6. *Units for Promotion.*
7. *To the several ranks, specifically.*

Prussia.

PURCHASE.

RECRUITS.

REGIMENTAL SYSTEM.

REJECTION.

REPORTS, CONFIDENTIAL.

RETIREMENT.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Voluntary.*
3. *Compulsory.*
4. *From specific ranks.*
5. *Artillery and Engineers.*
6. *Navy.*
7. *Pensions, &c.*
8. *General Officers.*

REWARDS.

Russia.

SCHOOLS, MILITARY.

SECONDED AND SUPERNUMERARY OFFICERS.

SELECTION.

SENIORITY.

SERVICE, MILITARY.

SERVICE IN THE RANKS.

SERVICE FOR PROMOTION.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Colonel.*
3. *Lieutenant-Colonel.*
4. *Major.*
5. *Captain.*

Spain.

STAFF.
1. *Admission, Selection, &c.*
2. *Tenure.*

STAFF COLLEGE.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Admission.*

SUPERSESSION.

Sweden.

Switzerland.

TABLEAU D'AVANCEMENT.

TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

TENURE.

UNATTACHED PROMOTION.

United States.

UNITS FOR PROMOTION.

VACANCIES.

VESTED RIGHTS.

WOOLWICH.

INDEX.

A.

ACCOUNTS.
In German Army very simple, no stoppages, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1072.

ADJUTANTS.
Might be captains and vacate after five years; the office is better qualification for Adjutant-General than passing through the Staff College, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2259.

AGE.
1. *Generally.*
2. *General Officers.*
3. *Field Officers.*
4. *Lieutenant-Colonels.*
5. *Majors.*
6. *Captains.*
7. *France.*

1. *Generally.*

A false criterion of efficiency, *Sir R. Airey*, 362, 363; *Sir C. Ellice*, 530.
Men differ; some are active late in life, *Duke of Cambridge*, 113. Is therefore against a hard and fast limit, *ib.*, 114. Whole army is becoming too old, *ib.*, 152.
Bad criterion, *Sir A. Horsford*, 676; but officers should be young in all ranks, *ib.*, 677.

2. *General Officers.*

Proposed not to promote any British or Indian Staff Corps colonel after age of 61 or 62, *Sir T. Pears*, 3432–3458; but the limit could not be applied to local officers, *ib.*, 3517–3519, 3572–3576.
A colonel after 60 should be ineligible, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2098.

3. *Field Officers.*

Should be young, *Sir C. Ellice*, 529.

4. *Lieutenant-Colonels.*

A man is fit to command at any age after 30; but should not remain after 55; 40 is the most efficient age, *Sir J. Adye*, 2498–2500. An army with the oldest lieutenant-colonel under 55 would have younger officers than most European armies, *ib.*, 2669.
Major should be ineligible for promotion after 50, *Sir J. Adye*, 2672.
Snould hold the rank from 45 to 50, *Sir R. Airey*, 366, 367.
Should not be promoted to, after 60 years of age, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1467, 1468. From 35 to 40 is the best age to accede to a command, *ib.*, 1469, 1470.
Younger commanding officers are wanted, *Duke of Cambridge*, 113. An officer should have a regiment by 35 to 40, *ib.*, 115, 116.
An officer ought to command a regiment after 30 years' service, *Sir C. Ellice*, 531.
Should not be at head of a regiment after 55, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2313.
A man ought to be fit at 30, but might still be so at 50, *Sir A. Horsford*, 678. Would exclude men from succeeding at 50, *ib.*, 679; though it would be hard to remove them at 45, *ib.*, 680.
Most fit to command a regiment from 35 to 45; in peace can do so up to 55; in war should begin at 28; but men vary much, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2078–2080.
A man should not command a regiment after 50, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1894.
An officer should not have more than 27 years' service on promotion to lieutenant-colonel, *Report*, p. xxxvi.
In Austria the command of an infantry regiment is reached at about 49, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1716.

5. *Majors.*

Captain should be ineligible for promotion after 47, *Sir J. Adye*, 2672.
A man should be a field officer at 40, *Sir R. Airey*, 365; but should not be promoted to the rank at 50, *ib.*, 364.
Should not be promoted to, after 30 years' service, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1464–1466.
An officer should not have more than 20 years' service on promotion to major, *Report*, p. 30.

AGE—*cont.*

6. *Captains.*

Ought to retire if not promoted after 30 years' service, *Duke of Cambridge*, 118.

7. *France.*

Excessive age of officers a consequence of inadequate retirement, *Col. Conolly*, 1271–1274, 1359, 1360.

ANNUITIES (as a substitute for brevet promotion).
Might be used instead of brevet, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1625.
Might take the place of brevets, *Duke of Cambridge*, 91–93, 220, 249; but most officers would prefer brevet rank, *ib.*, 250. A mixed system would be worth trying, *ib.*, 102, 103.
Objects to, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2169.
Table of "Equivalent Annuities," *Actuaries, App. M.*, p. 254.
See also DECORATIONS.

ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS.
1. *British.*
2. *Foreign.*

1. *British.*

Promotional system adopted in 1872 described in a letter to the Treasury, *App. J.*, p. 243.
Promotional system described, *Sir J. Adye*, 2398–2433. Would prefer selection; but does not see his way to it, *ib.*, 2598–2603.
Memoranda on changes of organization in Engineers since 1855, *Col. Browne, App. K.*, p. 250.
Unaware of supersession of British by Indian Artillery officers, *Sir T. Pears*, 3531–3535. Indian cadres are dying out; till they do there must be four seniority lists, *ib.*, 3536–3548, 3550, 3553.
Stagnation exists now in Artillery, but will be greater, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3685–3694, 3725. Present state of corps detailed, *ib.*, 3634, 3650, 3651, 3696–3699, 3720–3766. Memoranda on changes since 1855, *ib., App. K.*, p. 247.
The retirements offered are insufficient to tempt the officers, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1985–1988. Wonders candidates for, are found, *ib.*, 1875–1877, 2001–2003. Why senior cadets select the Engineers, *ib.*, 1991, 1992. 70 young officers required yearly, *ib.*, 1900.
How promotion has been hitherto maintained, *Report*, p. xl.; recommendations as to, *ib.*, pp. xxix–xxxi, §§ 36–44.
Probable state of promotion in 10 years ending 1885, *Actuaries, App. L.* (Artillery) p. 252; (Engineers) p. 253.
Calculated effects of Commissioners' proposals, *Actuaries, App. V., Part II.*, p. 271.

2. *Foreign.*

In France promotion as rapid as in the line, *Col. Conolly*, 1386.
Position of, in Prussia, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1076–1079.
See also "ENGINEERS;" GENERAL OFFICES, 2; ORGANISATION, 3; RETIREMENT, 5.

Austria.
Army organisation detailed, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1649–1841. (For Précis, *see* Digest, pages 10, 11.)
Memoranda on system of promotion and retirement, *Capt. Cooke, App. A.*, p. 199.

B.

BATH, ORDER OF.
Valued so highly, because so rarely given, *Duke of Cambridge*, 257, 258.

Belgium.
Promotion, pay, retirement, *Capt. Jessop, App. A.*, p. 202.

BONUS.
Average sums paid as, *Sir E. Lugard, App. Q.*, p. 260.
To induce retirement, is objectionable, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2116, 2248.

BREVET PROMOTION.
Advantages outweigh anomalies, *Sir J. Adye*, 2538–2550. Should be limited to really distinguished service, *ib.*, 2542–2545, 2596.
One objection is that field officers do company duty, *Sir R. Airey*, 449. Too lavishly bestowed, of late, *ib.*, 338, 348, 487. Regimental inconvenience of, *ib.*, 339–

Brevet Promotion—*cont.*

344. Not practised in any other European army, *ib.*, 345, 357. The only means of rewarding distinguished service, *ib.*, 345; but would rather see substantive promotion, *ib.*, 346, 347; which could be done, *ib.*, 348, 349. Would substitute an honour list, carrying decoration and money reward, *ib.*, 349–353, 489. Is opposed to the system of brevet, 352, 486–488.

Decoration, with reward, preferable, *Lieut. Amherst*, 3265–3268.

Not entirely satisfactory, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1490–1495; too profusely given, *ib.*, 1627–1629, 1641–1643.

Would abolish and substitute decoration with pension, *Capt. Borton*, 3142, 3143; disliked by army, *ib.*, 3145–3147.

Preferable to a good service pension, *Maj. R. Buller*, 2935, 2944.

Economical reward for service in the field, *Duke of Cambridge*, 248. Difficulty in curtailing it, *ib.*, 89, 90, 215, 216. Should be limited to distinguished personal service, *ib.*, 217–219. Its advantages, *ib.*, 91–93, 220, 249; is sometimes inconvenient in a regiment, *ib.*, 97–100.

In France nothing resembling, *Col. Conolly*, 1205, 1213, 1221.

Would abolish, *Capt. Dempster*, 3173–3176.

Desirable, for bringing forward young officers, *Sir C. Ellice*, 543–545; does not interfere with regimental efficiency, *ib.*, 547; but has been too freely bestowed, *ib.*, 548, 549, 615. Would limit to cases of special distinction, *ib.*, 550–554. Knows of no alternative system, *ib.*, 616.

Fatal system, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2321, 2324; would abolish altogether, *ib.*, 2322; and substitute promotion to another regiment or unattached, *ib.*, 2323–2326.

Too lavish, *Sir A. Horsford*, 654; but difficult to restrict, *ib.*, 662–664. Chokes upper ranks, *ib.*, 656, 658. Sees no other way of rewarding distinguished service, *ib.*, 655, 659. Regimental inconvenience rare, *ib.*, 657.

Would abolish entirely; a decoration, with pecuniary reward, would be preferable, *Maj. Hudson*, 3085–3090, 3116–3124.

Would retain, to bring on deserving men, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2995; but is too lavishly distributed, *ib.*, 2996–2997.

Not objectionable, within due limits, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2082, 2164. Other rewards might be combined with it, *ib.*, 2170.

Too freely given, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1966–1968; often no reward at all, *ib.*, 1956–1958; though, generally, an advantage to a man, 1962. Regimental inconvenience, *ib.*, 1963–1965. Promotion for distinguished service should be substantive, *ib.*, 1952–1955, 1969, 2013.

Too lavishly bestowed, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3324; but advantageous if in reward for distinguished merit, *ib.*, 3325.

Disapproves, *Lieut. Swinburne*, 3206, 3207.

Nothing corresponding to, in Prussia, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 768–773, 1081.

Should be continued for distinguished service, under strict limitations; but for seniority, only for a time, *Report*, p. xxxiv.

See also Annuities: Decorations.

Brigade Depôts.

The commands must be made more tempting than they are now, *Sir A. Horsford*, 723.

C.

Cavalry.

Recommendations special to (Nos. 25, 26), *Report*, p. 19.

College, Military.

Prefers garrison instructors to an extended college for young officers, *Maj. R. Buller*, 2892.

Colonels.

The large number unemployed get rusty before becoming major-generals, *Sir R. Airey*, 377–391. Compulsory retirement, the only remedy, *ib.*, 380–383, 391.

Numbers and probable age before becoming general officer, *Actuaries, App. B.*, p. 260.

Colonelcies of Regiments.

See General Officers, 6.

Commissions and Committees.

On Promotion and Retirement, *App. B.*, p. 223.

On questions connected with amalgamation of British and Indian armies, *App. Y.*, p. 281.

Control Department.

Should be taken from army officers, *Duke of Cambridge*, 122–124, especially lieutenants, *ib.*, 227, 228.

Appointments might be given to officers as a means of procuring retirement, *Sir C. Ellice*, 590, say one to every five promotions in the Control Department, *ib.*, 592, 593.

Cost.

Estimated cost of proposals of Commission, *Report*, p. xxxvii–xl, *Actuaries, App. V.*, p. 262; *App. W.*, p. 275; *App. X.*, p. 279.

D.

Decorations.

Enough already, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1626.

If carrying pecuniary reward might be appreciated in lieu of brevet, if not too common, *Duke of Cambridge*, 257, 258.

Substitution for brevet considered, *Sir A. Horsford*, 712–716.

With pension, would be fairer than brevet, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2992–2994.

Might be substituted for brevet promotion; but would not give the same substantial advantage, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2089, 2090, 2167, 2168.

Better than a money reward, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1969–1971; but both might be combined, *ib.*, 1972.

Desirable as a reward, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3330; but perhaps mixing honour and money would not be good, *ib.* 3332.

Some decoration, carrying a small pension, to be used as a supplement to brevet promotion, *Report*, p. xxxiv.

In Prussia, carry neither rank nor pay: their abundance depreciates them, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1080–1084.

See also Annuities.

Denmark.

Promotion, pay, retirement, &c., *Capt. W. S. Cooke, App. A.*, p. 204.

Dossier, Annual, on French officers, *Col. Conolly*, 1160, 1161, 1259.

E.

Education, Military.

The present means of professional education are sufficient, *Sir J. Adye*, 2664.

Would rather raise the general standard of army education, than have a few highly-educated professors, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2147; moral characteristics are required as much as intellectual qualities, *ib.*, 2252; but our best officers are those most highly educated, *ib.*, 2063, 2252.

In Germany described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 856–873, 977–983, 1015–1044.

Engineers, Royal.

Has heard no complaint of supersession between the several cadres, *Col. Browne*, 3848–3853. Upper ranks are young, *ib.*, 3825, 3859; but there is already stagnation among the subalterns, *ib.*, 3788–3791; and a very dark outlook, *ib.*, 3825–3858. Promotion is by seniority, but employment by selection, *ib.*, 3809–3811; great equality of age among officers, *ib.*, 3826; the state of promotion detailed, *ib.*, 3827–3842.

Would not allow Engineer officers who take purely civil appointments to qualify for promotion, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3913–3917.

Cadre to give a certain promotion in, *Actuaries, App. S.*, p. 261.

Recommendations as to, *Report*, pp. xxxi., xxxii., secs. 45–48.

See also Artillery and Engineers.

Entrance of Officers for First Commissions.

1. *Competition.*
2. *Passing a Test.*
3. *Foreign Systems.*

1. *Competition.*

Approves competition, *Sir J. Adye*, 2558, 2559. Candidates exceed vacancies, *ib.*, 2530; better educated men come in, *ib.*, 2615; but doubts whether they will constitute a more professional class, *ib.*, 2616–2619.

Does not secure the best officers, *Sir R. Airey*, 432–437. Would require candidates to pass a test examination *ib.*, 438.

Favours crammers, *Lieut. Amherst*, 3276.

Officers entering by competition differ little from their predecessors, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1548; but has little faith in it, *ib.*, 1549, 1550; would require a liberal

ENTRANCE OF OFFICERS FOR FIRST COMMISSIONS—*cont.*
education and make the entrance examination more professional, *ib.*, 1551, 1553.
Much the same class of men come as before, *Duke of Cambridge*, 104; system objectionable, *ib.*, 106; as looking only to intellectual acquirements, *ib.*,107, 112.
Much the same class enter as formerly, *Sir C. Ellice*, 585, 586.
Same class enter as before purchase was abolished, *Lieut. Gough*, 3238.
No social difference between present and former young officers, *Sir A. Horsford*, 699–701.
Has not excluded the same class as entered formerly, only they come in better educated, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1867–1873, 2007–2009; cramming brings the wrong men, *ib.*, 1871, broken down, the great point is to defeat it, *ib.*, 1869, 1870, 2005–2007, 2030.

2. *Passing a Test.*

Should be by a qualifying examination, with standard as high or low as you like, *Duke of Cambridge*, 106, 108, 109, 221; candidates could be arranged in the order of qualifying, *ib.*, 222–224.

3. *Foreign Systems.*

Austrian system described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1698, 1715, 1729–1733, 1770–1774, 1791–1796, 1821–1824.
In France, through the ranks only unless the entrant have passed a military school, *Col. Conolly*, 1230–1232, 1316–1328, 1358, 1382, 1383.
In Prussia, all pass through the ranks, *Major-Gen. Walker*, 1108, usually serving there one year, *ib.*, 837, 838; and coming in under a severe examination, *ib.*, 1028. There is a dearth of candidates, *ib.*, 1059, 1060.

EQUIVALENT ANNUITIES.
Calculations as to, *Actuaries, App. M.*, p, 254.

EXAMINATIONS, GENERALLY.
Objects to a scholastic test for military efficiency, *Sir R. Airey*, 359–361.

EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION.
Speaking generally, are sufficient, *Duke of Cambridge*, 247.

EXCHANGE.
In favour of free exchange between linked battalions, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 3009, without going to the bottom of the list, *ib.*, 3010–3014.

F.

"FIVE-YEARS' RULE" FOR RETIREMENT.
1. *Generally.*
2. *As applied to Lieutenant-Colonels.*
3. *As applied to Majors.*

1. *Generally.*

Good as a means of removing an unfit officer, *Sir R. Airey*, 368, 490, but not beneficial to the service, *ib.*, 370, 371, 491–497.
Disapproves; except as a means of removing an unsatisfactory officer; *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1520–1524, 1572–1578, 1607.
Disapproves, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3929. If rigidly applied and supplemented by adequate retirement, would tend to secure proper promotion, *ib.*, 134–137, 233, 234. The main objection is that it would flood the half-pay list, *ib.*, 138.
Would retain; but not act on so long as an officer should be efficient, *Sir C. Ellice*, 555–562, 617–619.
A good rule, *Major Hudson*, 3091, 3094.
Undoubtedly advantageous to regiments, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2953, 2954. On completion, officers would accept retirement, if the pensions were commensurate with previous income, *ib.*, 2963–2970.
Objects to, for Artillery; though it would give promotion, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3713–3719. Does not like it anywhere, *ib.*, 3667–3670.

2. *As applied to Lieutenant-Colonels.*

Approves, for lieutenant-colonels; but there should be power to extend it to seven, *Sir J. Adye*, 2442–2444.
On completion, must go to half-pay unless re-appointed, *Sir R. Airey*, 372–376, 388.
The lieutenant-colonel remaining in command blocks promotion, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1531, 1532, 1619, and, if left too long, loses energy, *ib.*, 1617, 1618, 1647. Without this rule the major succeeding might be too old, *ib.*, 1620.
Would maintain, as a retirement, *Duke of Cambridge*, 128, with re-appointment whenever a man has shown efficiency, *ib.*, 125–127, 229.
Ought to be retained for use if required, *Sir A. Horsford*, 668. It would help promotion very largely, *ib.*, 669; but it is a pity to remove a good officer, *ib.*, 668, unless his status be thereby improved, *ib.*, 722. It could only be worked by offering the officer removed a good retirement, *ib.*, 670. Without it, the only way to obtain promotion is to make retirement worth while, *ib.*, 682.
Thinks a limit of age for lieutenant-colonels preferable, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1878.
Disapproves, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3346–3350, 3367–3373, except as a means of getting quit of inefficient officers, *ib.*, 3370–3372.
To be maintained, subject to special exceptions, *Report*, p. xxviii.; to be extended to Artillery, *ib.*, p. xxx., sec. 42, and Engineers, *ib.*, p. xxxii., sec. 46.

3. *As applied to Majors.*

A terrible prospect, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3929, 3930. The rule would crowd the half-pay list, *ib.*, 125–127, to which Treasury would object, *ib.*, 130. If they had to be brought back there would be no gain to promotion, *ib.*, 132. Would only apply it to majors of very long service, and then as a retirement, *ib.*, 133.
Objectionable, *Sir A. Horsford*, 670, as ousting the officer from his profession, *ib.*, 671–674, 684.
Would apply rigidly to the new majors, with a large proportion of re-appointments, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2280–2290.

FOOT GUARDS.
Will be organized exactly as the Line, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3903, 3912.
When organised as the Line, should be subject as regards post-purchase Officers to same rules for retirement, &c., *Report*, p. xxii.; Recommendations special to, Nos. 19–24, pp. xxiii., xxiv.

France.
Army organization detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1113–1456. (For classified epitome, *see* DIGEST, pages 8–10.)
Promotion, pay, retirement, &c., *Lieut.-Col. Home, App. A.*, p. 205.
In Crimea there was a broad line between officers from the ranks and those from a better class, *Sir J. Adye*, 2621–2625.

G.

GENERAL OFFICERS.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Artillery and Engineers.*
3. *Fixed Establishment.*
4. *Grades.*
5. *Half-Pay List.*
6. *Honorary Colonelcies.*
7. *Pay.*
8. *Qualification.*
9. *Retired List.*

1. *Generally.*

Present system satisfactory, *Duke of Cambridge*, 155, 156.
On promotion to the rank of general officer, *Actuaries, App. Z.*, p. 282.
The case considered, *Report*, p. xxv.–xxviii.

2. *Artillery and Engineers.*

Does not desire an amalgamated list, *Col. Browne*, 3843–3847.
Would add 12 to the Artillery, and then amalgamate with other arms, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3633–3665; the Artillery would get their fair share of promotions, *ib.*, 3756–3759.
Calculation as to, *Actuaries, App. T.*, p. 261.
To be increased in number and to retire at 70, *Report*, p. xxxii., sec. 48.

3. *Fixed Establishment.*

Would have a small fixed active list, *Sir J. Adye*, 2470, 2472-2474; somewhat larger than the number of commands, *ib.*, 2466. Colonels should be promoted to be major-generals by seniority throughout all branches of the Army, *ib.*, 2469, 2471.
Only way to prevent absorption by Indian Staff Corps is to give the latter a separate establishment, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3875–3884. The British officers have a right to look forward to succession to 275 general officers, *ib.*, 3880. Necessity for change very pressing, *ib.*, 3882. Ante-dating leads to confusion, *ib.*, 3885–3888, 3893–3898. To limit promotion to colonels employed within a given number of years would be a great advantage, but very difficult, *ib.*, 3927, 3928.
Would not object to increase, *Sir C. Ellice*, 565.
The 100 senior colonels should have extra pay, but no claim to promotion, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2297, 2298,

General Officers—*cont.*

2300, 2310. Peace establishment should be limited to 100 major-generals and 25 lieutenant-generals, all promoted by rigid selection from colonels, *ib.*, 2295, 2296, 2300.

An increase would relieve the lieutenant-colonels, but at an additional expense, *Sir A. Horsford*, 694–696.

Sees no objection beyond the question of supersession, to a total separation of the British and Indian lists, *Sir T. Pears*, 3422–3425, 3502–3506, 3512, 3577–3579. Expense of extra major-generals, caused by the amalgamation, has fallen on the British Government, *ib.*, 3580.

Would have a varying list, according to army requirements, and promote to it and to successive grades by selection and service, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2091–2098, 2171–2179, 2238, 2243, 2271. The present establishment is practically a retired list, *ib.*, 2099.

Should be much smaller than now, and fed by promotion direct from regiments, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1944–1947.

Probable ages of colonels on becoming general officers, *Actuaries, App. R.*, p. 260.

Note on succession to, *Secretary, App. Z.*, p. 281.

To be gradually reduced to 275 for Guards and line, *Report*, p. xlii.

In Austria, formed by selection from colonels, but promotion goes ordinarily to the seniors, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1717–1719. Number depends on posts to be filled, *ib.*, 1799–1803.

In France, a fixed establishment, *Col. Conolly*, 1201–1204, 1307–1310; no marshals, *ib.*, 1202, 1312; no generals, *ib.*, 1306, 1310.

In Germany, no limit except the amount voted, but there are few beyond those actually employed, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 895–906, who number 255, *ib.*, 924.

4. *Grades.*

Would reserve rank of general for special cases, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2377, 2381.

Would abolish rank of brigadier-general, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2098.

5. *Half-Pay List.*

Would do away with, *Sir R. Airey*, 396–399.

6. *Honorary Colonelcies.*

Preferable to any modification yet heard of, *Sir R. Airey*, 401, 402.

Unobjectionable and popular with army, *Duke of Cambridge*, 171–173, 239, 240. Preferable to graduated scale of pay, *ib.*, 241.

Approves of, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2207.

Cavalry colonels appointed since the Warrant of 12th August 1873 should be specially considered, *Report*, p. 286.

In Austria the "Inhaber" has no administrative power or increase of pay, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1761–1768, 1784–1788.

In Germany do not carry pay, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 911–913, 998.

7. *Pay.*

Graduated rates proposed, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2098, 2238, 2243.

In Austria depends on rank, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1728.

In Prussia paid on a graduated scale according to rank and charge, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 996–1001.

8. *Qualification.*

Some qualification after becoming lieutenant-colonel is essential, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3941, 3942; though not formerly demanded, *ib.*, 3939, 3940.

9. *Retired List.*

A major-general should be able to retire after 60 on 600*l.* a year, and be compelled to do so at any age if for five years without a command; lieutenant-general similarly at 65 on 800*l.*; general after five years' non-employment on 1,200*l.* a year, *Sir J. Adye*, 2457–2465, 2468.

In favour of, *Sir R. Airey*, 393. Removal to should depend on age and non-employment for five or seven years, *ib.*, 384, 386, 387, 394–396; but should not prevent succession to honorary colonelcy, *ib.*, 400.

Would have, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1496–9, without limit, *ib.*, 1568, and without diminishing active list, *ib.*, 1509, 1510, as a mode of creating promotion, *ib.*, 1511, 1515, 1607. Conditions of passing to, *ib.*, 1500, 1504–1508, 1580.

Separation very desirable, though difficult, *Duke of Cambridge*, 157, 158. Grounds for removal to, *ib.*, 159, 160, 174, 191. It would be virtually an addition to the general officers, *ib.*, 161–166, 190, or no benefit, *ib.*, 179, 180. It would be fair to the individual and a benefit to the State, *ib.*, 181. For financial reasons there would have to be a fixed limit, not too rigid, *ib.*, 188, 189. It would be a desirable rule to retire a general officer after so many years unemployed, *ib.*, 3934.

Retirement should be voluntary after 40 years' service, with rather higher pay but no chance of honorary colonelcy, *Sir C. Ellice*, 596–600, and without a step of rank, *ib.*, 601.

Should be unlimited and on full pay, lieut.-generals should retire at 65, major-generals at 60, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2300–8.

Sees no objection to, *Sir A. Horsford*, 689, as a means of making more generals, *ib.*, 690.

Would have a fixed retired list, and promote colonels to it by seniority, not debarring them from honorary colonelcies, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2091–2098, 2171–2179, 2271. Officers from the active list, when too old, could be put on, if they did not lose pay, *ib.*, 2101, 2198–2206. Would not apply the plan to the present generation, *ib.*, 2272.

In favour of, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1944.

General Officers to be removed to, at age of 70 *Report*, pp. xxvii., xxviii, sec. 35.

In Austria forms a separate list, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1723–1727, 1804.

In Prussia, form a separate list, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 924–933; there are 387 on it, *ib.*, 935. The pension depends on service and the rank quitted, *ib.*, 939.

Germany.

Army organization described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 728–1112.

(For details, *see* Digest of Evidence, pp. 7, 8.)

Promotion, pensions, &c., *Capt. F. Clarke, App. A.*, p. 211.

See also Prussia.)

Good Service Pension.

Should not be awarded to a man already retired, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3900–3902.

Gros-Major.

In France; functions described, *Col. Conolly*, 1132–1134, 1303–1305.

H.

Half-pay.

Does not object to retain after 25 years' service, *Sir J. Adye*, 2491–2493. Little accepted in Artillery, *ib.*, 2495. Might be allowed after 15 years' service, for 10 years limited, on condition of service in militia, *ib.*, 2447, 2448, 2509–2515, 2614, 2636, 2637, 2656–2658.

To keep an officer on half-pay, except from ill health is undesirable, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1536. It would be an improvement if half-pay, before becoming general officer, could be avoided altogether, *ib.*, 1512, 1513, 1648; a retirement of 25*s.* a day, with honorary rank, might prevent it, *ib.*, 1514–1517; but would not make this retirement compulsory, *ib.*, 1518, 1519, 1607.

The worst thing which can happen to a man, *Duke of Cambridge*, 129, 230, 233. Very desirable to abridge period of, before becoming major general, *ib.*, 170. After three or four years, a colonel becomes too rusty for further service, *ib.*, 3897. A general officer should be promoted straight from a regiment, or within a year or two of leaving one, *ib.*, 3928; but the five years' rule is a great obstacle, *ib.*, 3929.

Half-pay lieutenant colonels get rusty, *Sir C. Ellice*, 564.

A necessary list; but should be kept as small as possible, *Sir A. Horsford*, 666.

An artillery officer would soon lose proficiency, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3671.

Approves of a man being his own master for two or three years before becoming major general; to be longer on half-pay is undesirable, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2102, 2103.

Very undesirable between regimental duty and becoming a major general, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1949.

Not desirable that a colonel after leaving a regiment should be long upon, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3353.

In Prussia there is no interval between the command of a regiment and that of a brigade, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 898–900, 1009.

See also General Officers, 5.

Holland.

Promotion, pension, &c., *Capt. F. Clarke, App. A.*, p. 212.

HONOUR, COURT AND COUNCIL OF.
In Prussia described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 948–958, 1088.

HOUSEHOLD CAVALRY.
Recommendations as to, *Report*, p. xxxiii.

I.

INDIA, BRIGADES IN.
Some change is required in mode of selecting for, *Report*, p. xxxi.

INDIA, LOCAL RANK IN.
Is objectionable, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1601.
Disapproves, *Sir T. Pears*, 3520–3522.
Should cease as each rank becomes extinct in Indian Army, *Report*, p. 285.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.
Ranks incompatible with any scale of promotion likely to take place in English army, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1602.
System of, described, *Sir T. Pears*, 3412–3473, 3507–3528, 3560–3566.
Really, a system of supernumerary upper ranks, *Report*, p. x. Their general officers should be separated from the British List, *ib.*, p. xl–xlii; and should retire at 70 years of age, *ib.*, p. xlii.

Italy.
Promotion, pay, pension, &c., *Lieut.-Col. Home, App. A.*, p. 214.

L.

LEGION OF HONOUR.
System of giving, in France, *Col. Conolly*, 1223–1225, 1255–1262, 1335–1338.

M.

MAJORS.
Opposed to increase of; which, while increasing promotion for captains, would leave the mass of majors to be got rid of, *Sir R. Airey*, 439, 441. Captains do duties which would be *infra dig* for field officers, *ib.*, 442–446, though brevet field officers now perform them, *ib.*, 447, 448, 457.
Regrets the extensive substantive promotion given to Artillery and Engineers, *Sir A. Horsford*, 724–727.
Promoted for distinguished service. No alteration recommended, *Report*, p. 285.

MEMORIALS OF OFFICERS, ROYAL COMMISSION ON.
Their recommendations compared with those of present Commission, *Actuaries, App. P.*, p. 259.

N.

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.
In Prussia, the want of, severely felt, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1031.

O.

OFFICERS.
In the general run, men are much on a par, *Duke of Cambridge*, 68.
Among regimental officers there is a uniformity of merit, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2058, 2209.
In Austria, absence of aristocratic element marked, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1796.

ORGANIZATION.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Corps, Divisions, Brigades.*
3. *Artillery.*
4. *Cavalry.*
5. *Infantry.*

1. *Generally.*

To prevent supersession, all arms should be organized on same principle, *Sir J. Adye*, 2573, 2587. Would readjust the ranks to meet difficulties of promotion, *ib.*, 2508.
There ought to be three officers to every troop or company, *Sir R. Airey*, 460, 461. Present numbers insufficient for real service, *ib.*, 507, 508, 515.
Every troop or company should have three officers, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1557, 1559, 1560, with more in India, *ib.*, 1558.
Objects to any increase of field officers, *Duke of Cambridge*, 192, 193; even for war, *ib.*, 194. Prussians have less, though their unit is larger, *ib.*, 195. There ought to be three officers to a troop or company; and in India four, *ib.*, 260–262.
Field officers might be equalized in the several arms, *Sir C. Ellice*, 602; would not object to more majors, provided the captains and subalterns were not diminished, *ib.*, 603–607.
Would reduce numbers in all ranks, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1883–1885, 1888, 1930.
The question of, not before the Commission, *Report*, p. x., xiii.; but re-organization might render compulsory retirement from lower ranks unnecessary, *ib.*, p. xiii.
In France, peace organization admits of ready expansion for war, *Col. Conolly*, 1387, 1388.
In Prussia, the same in peace as in war, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1014. The same (for officers) in all arms, *ib.*, 737–739. There are less captains and more subalterns than in the British army, *ib.*, 1061–1065.
In Germany, the units are infantry company, cavalry squadron, battery of artillery, company of engineers, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 762, 1048.
In Germany nearly 19,000 officers are actively employed, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 868; there was a terrible deficiency in the field, *ib.*, 1069.

2. *Corps, Divisions, Brigades.*

Austrian system described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1668–1674, 1827–1830.
In France detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1135–1148.
Prussian described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 786, 787.

3. *Artillery.*

Would reduce the majors to prevent supersession, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1630–1634; without reference to artillery efficiency, *ib.*, 1632. There is consistency in having a major over a horse artillery battery, *ib.*, 1635–1637.
In France, a battery is commanded by a captain, *Col. Conolly*, 1279.
In Germany, proportion of superior officers increased, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 741, 746, 751, 827, 1074, 1075.

4. *Cavalry.*

Squadron the unit in all foreign armies, *Sir R. Airey*, 462, 463.
Squadron failed as a unit from difficulties attending detachment duty, *Duke of Cambridge*, 242–245.
Must resort to the squadron as a unit if necessary to give more majors, *Sir C. Ellice*, 609–614.
Proposes a new cadre, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2183–2192, 2270.
By squadron organization would save 205 officers, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1930, 1943.
Squadron organization failed, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3401–3403.
Proposed re-organization, *App. N.*, p. 257.
Austrian described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1777–1783.
France detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1341–1348.
Prussian described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1049–1058.

5. *Infantry.*

Should be by double companies under majors, *Sir J. Adye*, 2434. It would diminish the officers, and be more efficient in the field, *ib.*, 2531–2534, and would not cost more, *ib.*, 2661.
Opposed to double companies, *Sir R. Airey*, 439, 460. Only knows of them in Prussian army, *ib.*, 464; the French have the company and small battalions, *ib.*, 465.
Double companies, an open question, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1638–1640.
Would not enlarge our unit beyond 100 men to a company, *Duke of Cambridge*, 196. No objection to captains being mounted, *ib.*, 195.
Double companies would be an advantage in the field; but some company duties might be unacceptable to majors, *Capt. Dempster*, 3177–3184.
Prefers the company, but must resort to double companies if necessary for promotion, *Sir C. Ellice*, 609–614. There should be three officers to a company at home, and four in India, *ib.*, 626.
Large companies commanded by majors would be injurious, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2331–2337, 2371–2374.
A double company would be too much for one officer to look after, *Maj. Hudson*, 3108–3115.
Double companies under majors would benefit promotion, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 3003; and, in the field would be more efficient than the present system, *ib.*, 3005–3008, 3043.
Double companies under majors would solve the promotion difficulty (knows no other method), and be a better tactical organization for the field, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2116–2120, 2127, 2140, 214[illegible] 2180–2182, 2258–2265, 2273–2282. Proposes a new cadre of officers for infantry battalion, *ib.*, 2121–2139, 2193–2197, 2266.
The establishment should be based on the number of companies, and the cadre of officers should be the same at home or abroad, *Sir. J. L. Simmons*, 1936; always on a war footing, *ib.*, 1937, 1981–1984; filling up the

ORGANIZATION—*cont.*

rank and file from the reserve, as necessary, *ib.*, 1936, 1938. Details of organization recommended, including double companies under majors, *ib.*, 1930, 1939. Would save 1,300 officers in infantry, *ib.*, 1940, 2018.

Double companies under majors would be desirable, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3380–3384; but no officers ought to be reduced, *ib.*, 3385, 3386, least of all flank majors, *ib.*, 3407–3409.

Proposed re-arrangement of ranks to obviate retirement as captain, *App. N.*, p. 256.

Effects of re-organization on prospects of officers, cost of retirement, &c., *Actuaries. App. O.*, p. 257.

Austrian, described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1654–1666, 1810, 1812, 1816, 1817, 1841.

France, detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1121–1131, 1196, 1197. In the manœuvres no battalion exceed 300 men, *ib.*, 1289. Process of expansion for war, *ib.*, 1290–1302, 1395, 1396.

Organization of a German regiment described, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 764–785, 1064–1067. The advantage of the double company is still a moot point, *ib.*, 1045, 1046, 1070, 1071.

P.

PAY, &c.

Lieutenant colonel of a regiment has about 600*l.* a year, *Sir C. Ellice*, 568, 569.

In France, detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1403, 1406, 1418, 1445.

PAYMASTERS.

Should be taken from army officers, *Duke of Cambridge*, 122–124.

Might be given to officers as a means towards retirement, *Sir C. Ellice*, 590. They were formerly so appointed, *ib.*, 594; now, by the Secretary of State, *ib.*, 595.

Should be appointed from competent combatant officers, *Report*, p. xiv.

In Germany, a military officer in the position of a civil officer, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1111. One to each battalion *ib.*, 1072.

PROMOTION.

1. *Generally.*
2. *By Purchase.*
3. *By Selection.*
4. *By Seniority.*
5. *Unattached.*
6. *Units for Promotion.*
7. *To the several Ranks, specifically.*

1. *Generally.*

List of Commissions and Committees on promotion, *App. B.*, p. 223.

Cost and effects of the present system in the normal, *Actuaries, App. E.*, p. 231.

Doubts if officers will become lieutenant-colonels in 25 years during peace, *Sir J. Adye*, 2489 2490.

Will stagnate, as formerly in seniority corps, *Duke of Cambridge*, 140.

Often too rapid in war; in peace, necessarily slow, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2115.

Number of officers who had entered each year of service in each rank on 1st July 1875, *Report*, **p. 2**, *Actuaries, App. D.*, p. 229, 231.

Calculated normal effects of proposals of Commission, *Actuaries, App. V.*, p. 263.

Promotion cannot be maintained without paid retirement in the lower ranks, *Report*, p. 4, and to secure efficiency must not be slower than under purchase, *ib.*, p. xxxvii.

Austrian system of, described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1734–41, 1805–1815.

France, system of seniority and selection detailed, *Col. Conolly*, 1115–1120, 1149–1163, 1180–1183, 1194, 1199, 1200, 1215–1220, 1259, 1284–1287, 1323.

2. *By Purchase.*

A grossly incompetent man would not have been promoted, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3872–3874.

An inefficient man could not be excluded, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2212–2215.

Average rates of promotion during 30 years preceding abolition of Purchase, *Report*, **p. viii.**; *Actuaries, App. C.*, p. 223.

Number of officers who had entered each year of service in each rank on 1st November 1871, *Report*, **p. viii.**; *Actuaries, App. D.*, pp. 227, 231.

Purchase provided retirement for the lower ranks, *Report*, p. xi.

Diagrams showing number of purchase officers in 1871, with their subsequent promotion, *App. F.*, opposite p. 238.

Purchase Officers who accept promotion must be held to come under any new rules, *Report*, p. xvii.

3. *By Selection.*

Constantly made from one regiment to another, for distinguished service, *Sir R. Airey*, 306. The number should be left to discretion of Commander-in-Chief, *ib.*, 311–313; impossible to promote a man in his regiment over the head of his seniors, *ib.*, 314–316; 466–471, 483–484.

Would not give accelerated promotion for passing Staff College or for foreign service, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1483, 1484.

Could only be for efficiency in the field, *Sir C. Ellice*, 539; and then the officer should be promoted out of his regiment, *ib.*, 540, 541.

Selection is, by regulation, the present rule, *Duke of Cambridge*, 1; in practice, it should not be carried beyond rejecting inefficient officers, *ib.*, 29–32, 79; it would be impossible in peace, *ib.*, 33–37, 61; in a case of very conspicuous merit it is very advantageous, *ib.*, 38, 199, 201; when made, it should be into another regiment, *ib.*, 62.

Would not answer at all, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2355.

In favour of, tempered by regimental seniority, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2032–2039, 2208; but in time of peace seniority must greatly prevail, *ib.*, 2040, 2041, 2049–2052, 2059, 2209, 2219, 2220. Commanding officers might have an initiative in recommending for promotion, *ib.*, 2047, 2048, 2237. Carried out all appointments in Bengal, by selection, for five years, without difficulty, *ib.*, 2244.

Objects to, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1860–1863.

Is practicable, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3283–3300, 3303; awakens zeal, *ib.*, 3302; an inefficient officer ought to be removed from the army before he becomes a captain, *ib.*, 3333–3339.

Every vacancy is at the absolute disposal of the Crown, *Report*, p. xxxii.

In Prussia, there is very little, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 742, 916; but acceleration is caused by service on staff, *ib.*, 841, 846–854, 978.

4. *By Seniority.*

In favour of, in regiments, tempered by selection, *Sir R. Airey*, 265–270, 287, 330; rejection should involve retirement, *ib.*, 286, 335, 336, 505.

Should be by regimental seniority in all grades, with rejection of inefficient officers, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1459–1467, 1471–1475, 1486, 1487, 1569–1571.

Seniority, tempered by rejection of incompetent seniors, is best and fairest, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3–5, 8, 69, 198; seniority would be popular in the army, *ib.*, 46; would carry it up to the lieutenant-colonels, *ib.*, 41–43, 78; rejection is a great instrument for keeping officers up to the mark, *ib.*, 70, 71; and necessary, unless an unfavourable report on an officer can be cancelled, *ib.*, 21, 72; but destroys a man's career and is a very delicate process, *ib.*, 28. Should pass over an officer who did not pass the examination for a superior appointment, *ib.*, 246.

Should hold, in peace, up to lieutenant-colonel, only tempered by rejecting men palpably unfit or of too short service, *Sir C. Ellice*, 517, 542.

In favour of, up to lieutenant-colonel, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2311, 2312, 2350.

Is, as a general rule, in regimental turn if the officer be reported fit, *Sir A. Horsford*, 644–649.

Is in favour of, by large units, with rejection of incompetent men, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1842–1856. In Artillery and Engineers there is pure seniority up to colonel, *ib.*, 1989, 1990.

No other system than by regimental seniority tempered by rejection will work well; subject to the power of the Crown to select at will, *Report*, p. xxxii.

In Austria, holds, as a general rule, up to lieutenant-colonel by seniority through each arm, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1675–1677, 1688, 1694; withspecial promotion for officers, who have passed certain higher examinations, *ib.*, 1743; promotion is very slow and unsatisfactory *ib.*, 1744–1746; rejection takes place on a "qualification return," made on the officer by his superiors, *ib.*, 1678–1689, 1695–1701, 1789.

In Prussia, is the rule, subject to rejection of those not fully qualified, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 750–754, 1086, 1089; rejection is the whole system, *ib.*, 743–747, 750, 815–817, and highly effective, *ib.*, 1004–1008; most rejections are in the grade of major, *ib.*, 759, 793,

PROMOTION—*cont.*
797; officers are frequently removed from one regiment to another to equalize promotion taking rank according to their army commissions, *ib.*, 790, 791, 1090.

5. *Unattached.*

Difficulty of bringing the promoted officer back to full pay, *Sir R. Airey*, 306–310.
Is rather a loss than a gain, in consequence of the difficulty in bringing back to service the officer promoted, *Duke of Cambridge*, 63–67; therefore not so good as brevet-rank, *ib.*, 94–96.
By exchanging back to his regiment, an officer who had unattached promotion might, under Purchase, have passed over his seniors, *Sir C. Ellice*, 632–634; but few got back to full pay, *ib.*, 635.
Tends to shelve a man, *Sir A. Horsford*, 665–667.
Failed lamentably, as a substitute for brevet, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2089, 2090.
A limited number of promotions should be made annually for merit; the officers promoted to be brought into vacancies within a year, *Report*, p. xxxiii, secs. 49, 50.

6. *Units for Promotion.*

Objects to extend beyond the regiment, *Sir J. Adye*, 2629–2631.
Regiment a sufficient unit, *Sir C. Ellice*, 638. No evil in occasional inequality of promotion; but does not expect much, *ib.*, 523–526, 636, 637.
Regiment preferable to army at large, *Sir A. Horsford*, 650–652.
Would take the regiment, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2979, 2980, 3033, 3053.
Should be regimental, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3277–3281.
Prefers general, by branch of service, to regimental, *Capt. Dempster*, 3164–3170.
Artillery, engineers, cavalry, should, for promotion, be each one corps. On infantry, by regiments up to major (provided more than two years' advantage was not obtained). Majors by seniority throughout the corps or promotional district; lieutenant-colonels by seniority throughout the army; Colonels throughout the army, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1844–1855, 2010–2015.
Should be general throughout army, *Lieut. Swinburne*, 3192.
The regiment recommended, *Report*, p. xxxii.

7. *To the several Ranks, specifically.*

Effect on promotion of retirement from rank of lieutenant-colonel only, *Actuaries, App. H.*, p. 241.
Would promote a subaltern who had nothing definite against him, *Sir R. Airey*, 331.
For promotion to major would require proof of ability, *Sir R. Airey*, 332.
Promotion to major should be by army seniority in the arm of service, *Capt. Borton*, 3129–3132, 3152, 3154.
Captain's [Purchase] should be ineligible for promotion after 25 years' service, *Report*, p. xix (Recommendation 10); p. xxiv., secs. 25, 27.
In France, much passing over for the rank of major, *Col. Conolly*, 1164–1167, 1313, 1314, 1356, 1407. Service for, *ib.*, 1185, 1187, 1193. Few from the ranks, *ib.*, 1317–1320.
For lieutenant-colonel would require proof of ability, *Sir R. Airey*, 332–335.
In Prussia there is no command specifically attached to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 760, 761.
In Austria promotion to Colonel is according to a general seniority list, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1689–1692, 1699.
Would not except any from promotion to major-general who had qualified as colonel, *Duke of Cambridge*, 176–178.

Prussia.
The king gives any officer any rank he likes, *Sir R. Airey*, 357, 358.
The line is too extended for British troops, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3388, 3389.
In no other army are the officers so fitted for the positions they hold, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1003. Landwehr service unpaid, *ib.*, 1104, 1105.
See also Germany.

PURCHASE. *See* PROMOTION, 2.

R.

RECRUITS.
In Germany every company has two thirds of its number as recruits every year, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 876.

REGIMENTAL SYSTEM.
Would be sorry to interfere with, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1581–1583, 1597, 1600.
Not interfered with by promotions into a regiment, more than by exchanges, *Capt. Borton*, 3155, 3156.
Would be destroyed by selectional promotion in the regiment, *Duke of Cambridge*, 62; or by promotion by army seniority, *ib.*, 7. Inequality of promotion caused by it, is not an important evil, *ib.*, 44, 45. Best school for training officers, *Duke of Cambridge*, 209–213.
Bringing a man in occasionally does not hurt a regiment, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 3042.
Approves of, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2225, 2228, 2229; but the regimental idea has greatly changed of late years, *ib.*, 2226, 2227. The frequent infusion of new blood is beneficial, *ib.*, 2221, 2223; and no slur, *ib.*, 2224.
Shifting of officers on promotion would not do more harm than exchanges, *Lieut. Swinburne*, 3220, 3221.
In Austria, men move constantly from regiment to regiment, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1747–1751.

REJECTION. *See* PROMOTION, 4.

REPORTS, CONFIDENTIAL (ON OFFICERS).
Only way of learning special merit, *Sir R. Airey*, 303. The system is efficient, *ib.*, 271–273, 283; and not new, *ib.*, 482; officers reported against should be informed, *ib.*, 274–281. The inspectional mechanism, *ib.*, 472–481. Before being acted on, an adverse report ought to be substantiated by oral evidence, *ib.*, 285.
Afford sufficient information, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1477–1481. Has not heard of dissatisfaction, *ib.*, 1478. An adverse report should be made known to the officer reported on, *ib.*, 1479, 1480.
Received annually, *Duke of Cambridge*, 9, 200, 202, endorsed by inspecting officer, *ib.*, 10, 75–77; but need extraneous proof, *ib.*, 12, as different commanding officers have such different standards, *ib.*, 11. An unfavourable report ought at the time it is made to be shown to the officer reported on, *ib.*, 13, 20, 203–206.
Would only use for rejection, not selection, *Sir C. Ellice*, 518–522. Are reliable, *ib.*, 527, 528.
Not minute nor unflinching enough, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2342–2350; though the inspecting general should correct insufficiency, *ib.*, 2360–2364.
Two sorts, one general, on the regiment, the other special, on each officer. The latter annual, *Sir A. Horsford*, 640. Commanding officer ought to tell an officer he has reported unfavourably on him, *ib.*, 642, 643. Doubts if the form can be improved, *ib.*, 641.
Answer well, though not always sufficiently full, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2042–2044, 2056, 2142–2144, 2231–2237. Should be assisted by information from other sources, *ib.*, 2047. It is essential to the honour of the service that adverse reports be made known to the individuals reported on, *ib.*, 2045, 2251.
An officer should not be passed over on the report of one individual, and should be warned of an unfavourable report, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1856, 1857.
Admirable in theory; but lose prestige by being called confidential, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3288, 3378, 3379. An officer reported against should be told of it, *ib.*, 3299.
Memorandum on officers reported upon unfavourably in, *Col. Hawley, App. U.*, p. 262.
Will do much to maintain efficiency, *Report*, p. xxxiii.
Austrian system of "Qualification Returns," described, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1678–1679, 1695–1701, 1789.

RETIREMENT.
1. *Generally.*
2. *Voluntary.*
3. *Compulsory.*
4. *From specific Ranks.*
5. *Artillery and Engineers.*
6. *Navy.*
7. *Pensions, &c.*
8. *General Officers.* (*See* GENERAL OFFICERS, 9.)

1. *Generally.*

List of Commissions and Committees on, *App. B.*, p. 223.
Amount necessary to secure promotion at rates prevailing under Purchase, *Actuaries, App. G.*, p. 239.
Early retirement a mistake, *Sir J. Adye*, 2447, 2503–2507. Would encourage retirement at the top, and give outlets to juniors, *ib.*, 2508.
Ought to be made worth a man's while, *Duke of Cambridge*, 120. Should be full pay, including allowances; but more in the higher ranks, *ib.*, 146, 147, 235, 236. Does not expect retirement from captains and subalterns, *ib.*, 139. Any system will cause increased expense, *ib.*, 182–186.

RETIREMENT—*cont.*
Should be the same for all arms, *Sir C. Ellice*, 566.
Many officers would accept a fair retirement, *Sir A. Horsford*, 685–687; many would go without any, *ib.*, 688.
Paid retirement from lower ranks essential to promotion, *Report*, pp. x., xv.
Calculated normal effect of proposals of Commission, *Actuaries, App. V.*, p. 263.

2. *Voluntary.*

Would open various civil appointments to junior officers and recruit Ordnance and Commissariat Departments from captains, *Sir J. Adye*, 2516–2518, 2612, 2613, 2649–2655.
Desirable, in lower ranks, *Sir R. Airey*, 405–407. Officers would go for a smaller sum than they sold for under Purchase, *ib.*, 409–412. Must not be too good, *ib.*, 299–301; nor too small, *ib.*, 302.
Knows no appointments to be held out as inducements, except to subalterns, *Major-Gen. Armstrong*, 1611–1615.
A good retirement in the upper ranks would give promotion enough, *Sir C. Ellice*, 557–563, 579, 580, 620, 621.
There should be a marked distinction in favour of foreign service, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2976–2978.
Would allow, at five years earlier than the ages fixed for compulsion, beginning with age 37, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1923, 1926. Lump sums to younger officers have bad effects morally; for them, commissions in auxiliary forces are the best retirement, *ib.*, 1929.
Public works and other non-combatant appointments should be thrown open to officers, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3360, 3361.
Doubts if many subalterns would accept, *Lieut. Swinburne*, 3202–3205.
Voluntary retirements should only be allowed at the discretion of the military authorities, *Report*, p. xxii.
In Austria open to all ranks with full-pay after 40 years' service, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1704, 1707. Physical disability necessary for earlier retirement, *ib.*, 1704–1708.
In France rarely taken, *Col. Conolly*, 1264–1266; would not be refused after 25 years' service, is of right after 30 years, *ib.*, 1169, 1171, 1268–1270. Captains from the ranks go as soon as they can get their *retraite*, *ib.*, 1170, 1184. Officers retiring often seek civil government appointments, *ib.*, 1393–1402; and hold on for the sake of obtaining them, *ib.*, 1437.
In Prussia pensions rise by service to three-fourths the pay and allowances, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 961–968, 1107. Cannot be claimed until 60, except from ill-health, *ib.*, 879, 919–921; but a certificate of ill-health is only formal and never refused after 25 years' service, *ib.*, 880, 959. Civil employment is held out as an inducement to retire, *ib.*, 1106. Allowed for ill-health with pension after 10 years' service, *ib.*, 878.

3. *Compulsory.*

Non-employment should be coupled with age as a reason for retirement, *Sir J. Adye*, 2447. It is indispensable at the top, *ib.*, 2520. Would allow full pay retirement to all officers of 30 years' service, *ib.*, 2448.
Would have, to cause promotion, *Sir R. Airey*, 403, 404; captain at 20 years' service, *ib.*, 292; on full pay and allowances, *ib.*, 293–298.
After 25 years for captains would be willingly accepted by army, *Lieut. Amherst*, 3255. An officer passed over ought to retire at once, *ib.*, 3271.
An officer passed over ought to retire, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1476.
Approves for captains after 25 years' service. *Capt. Borton*, 3138.
To be avoided, if possible, but very difficult to avoid it, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3899. Must be accepted if essential to promotion, only the pension ought to be exceptionably good, *ib.*, 255, 256. An officer passed over by a junior in his regiment should retire, *ib.*, 22–27, 251–254.
Should only be resorted to when absolutely necessary and should then be good, *Sir C. Ellice*, 581–583.
Lieutenant-colonel at 55, major at 45, captain at 40, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2313, 2314, 2319, 2320. A man passed over in a regiment should leave it, *ib.*, 2340.
Would be excellent for captains after 25 years' service, *Maj. Hudson*, 3095, 3096. A man passed over ought certainly to retire, *ib.*, 3081–3084.
It would be an advantage if captains after certain service were compulsorily retired, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 2972. An officer passed over ought to retire, *ib.* 2998–3001.
Age a better limit than service, *Col. Ratcliffe*, 3653.
In favour of in all grades, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2105. An officer passed over in his regiment should retire, *ib.*, 2046, 2216–2218.
Would apply to all ranks at different ages, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1881, 1882, 1886, 1887, 1916, 1925, 1948; without exceptions, *ib.*, 1889.
Captains after 25 years' service, the only way out of the difficulty, *Lieut. Swinburne*, 3198–3201, 3208–3211; on not less than 250*l.* a year, *ib.*, 3212, 3213. A man passed over should have a second chance, *ib.*, 3189.
Compulsory retirement necessary to supplement voluntary retirement, Report, p. xv.
In Austria, none, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1703.
In France, universal at age of 62 for every officer not a *général de division*, *Col. Conolly*, 1188–1192, 1397–1399; none earlier, *ib.*, 1263.
None in Prussia on account of age, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 917, 918, 930. Officers twice passed over have to retire, *ib.*, 747, 756, 794, 1087.

4. *From specific ranks.*

a. Colonel.
b. Lieutenant-Colonel
c. Major.
d. Captain.
e. Subaltern.

a. Colonel.

25*s.* a day with honorary rank, might tempt officers to avoid half-pay before becoming general officers; but would not make it compulsory, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1514–1519, 1607.
Indispensable, if five years' rule is to be maintained, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3897, 3898, 3931, 3932.
Retirements recommended, *Report*, p. xxvii., secs. 33, 34; p. xxx, sec. 44.

b. Lieutenant-Colonel.

Estimated effect of retirement from rank of lieutenant-colonel only, *Actuaries, App. H.*, p. 241.
At 55 should have option of retiring on 400*l.* a year, *Sir J. Adye*, 2448, 2484; and in any arm, should be retired at 60 if not a major-general, or unemployed for seven years, *ib.*, 2449, 2452.
A liberal voluntary retirement would get rid of the probable stagnation, *Sir A. Horsford*, 692, 693 and relieve half-pay list, *ib.*, 697, 698.
Inefficient lieutenant-colonels should be made to retire, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3355–3359.
Retirement recommended for, *Report*, p. xvi., Recommendations 8, 9; p. xxi, Recommendation 18; p. xxix, sect. 40–42.

c. Major.

Should be compulsorily retired on full pay at 53, *Sir J. Adye*, 2672, and optionally after 30 years' service, *ib.*, 2479.
Would offer, rather than put them on, half-pay, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1533–1535.
Retirements recommended, *Report*, p. xvi., Recommendations, 5–7; pp. xx., xxi., Recommendations 16, 17; p. xxix., secs. 38, 39.
In Prussia a field officer commanding a battalion may retire after 25 years' service on 204*l.*, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 975.

d. Captain.

Should be optional after 25 years' service on 200*l.*, and compulsory at age 50 on 250*l.*, *Sir J. Adye*, 2672.
Retirement of captains after 20 years' service would give a younger body of field officers than now, *Sir R. Airey*, 299.
Might be offered full-pay and allowances after 20 to 25 years' service, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1537–1542.
Might be compulsorily retired at 25 years' service on full pay and allowances, *Sir C. Ellice*, 532–538. Opposed to giving lump sums in lower ranks as inducements to retire, *ib.*, 570–578.
Would offer after 20 years' service, but not after 15, *Sir A. Horsford*, 716–721.
Should retire if not promoted after 25 years' service on 200*l.* a year, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2106, 2108.
Approves of pensioning if not promoted after 20 years' service, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3340–3345.
Retirements recommended for, *Report*, p. xiii–xv., Recommendations 1–4; pp. xix., xx., Recommendations 11–15; p. xxix., secs, 26, 27; p. xxix., sec. 37.
In Prussia can retire after 25 years' service on 91*l.* 14*s.* a year, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 971–974.

RETIREMENT—*cont.*

e. Subaltern.

Sees no objection to, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1542–1547, 1607.

Should have a voluntary retirement after 10 years' service, *Duke of Cambridge*, 141.

Would offer to lieutenants after 10 or 12 years' service, *Sir A. Horsford*, 716–717.

5. *Artillery and Engineers.*

Should be compulsory in the higher ranks, *Sir J. Adye*, 2632–2634.

Past and present retirements for the Engineers detailed, *Col. Browne*, 3768–3782. They are not freely taken, *ib.*, 3783–3787, but perhaps would be if available for lower ranks, *ib.*, 3823–3824. The present voluntary system will not suffice for promotion, *ib.*, 3860, 3861. Would offer seniors 700*l.* a year, revert to Warrant of 1854 without money limit, and retire lieutenant-colonels on 500*l.*, *ib.*, 3864, 3865. Return of retirements from 1855 to 1875, *ib.*, *App. I.*, p. 242.

Colonels do not retire on 600*l.* a year, *Duke of Cambridge*, 147–150, 237.

600*l.* a year after 40 years' service, not successful, *Sir C. Ellice*, 567.

The present retirements for the Artillery and their action described, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3583–3632, 3677–3680. Would retire colonels compulsorily at 58 on 600*l.* a year, lower ranks on annuities after 22 years' service, *ib.*, 3633–3665. Colonels would not complain, *ib.*, 3710–3712; no advantage in retirements under 22 years' service, *ib.*, 3672–3674, 3704. Retirement for Artillery need not be distinctive from rest of army, *ib.*, 3684. Return of retirements from 1855 to 1875, *ib.*, *App. I.* p. 241.

6. *Navy.*

The system seems to answer fairly, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1898–1900, 2019–2025.

7. *Pension.*

Should be full pay after 25 years' service, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2317, 2318.

Under 15 years' service, might offer 100*l.* for each year of completed service, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2390–2394.

Rates proposed, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2108–2111.

Scale of, varying according to rank and service, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1909–1919, 2024.

The Indian system of pensions for length of service, without reference to rank, works well, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3394–3396.

In **France**, rates stated, *Col. Conolly*, 1409–1417; considered illiberal, *ib.*, 1438; and not attractive, *ib.*, 1267, 1401, 1436, 1440. Under Finance Minister, not War Office, *ib.*, 1275, 1389. Never heard of commutation, *ib.*, 1276, 1404.

REWARDS.

Money rewards might be substituted for brevet, *Sir A. Horsford*, 708–711.

Russia.

Promotion, pay, allowances, &c., *Capt. Jessop*, *App. A.*, p. 218.

S.

SCHOOLS, MILITARY.

France. Particulars as to, *Col. Conolly*, 1233–1245, 1321–1329, 1361–1365, 1384, 1385.

SECONDED AND SUPERNUMERARY OFFICERS.

Letter from the Accountant-General of the Army relative to supernumerary officers in the Artillery and Engineers, *App. J.*, p. 243.

Would second every officer employed away from regimental duty, *Sir R. Airey*, 509–515.

Staff College students should be seconded, *Capt. Borton*, 3158–3160.

Every officer appointed to the Staff should be supernumerary, *Duke of Cambridge*, 263. Opportunity for holding non-combatant appointments, while seconded for a limited time, should be given to all arms, *ib.*, 3918–3923.

Would second all officers appointed to the Staff, *Capt. W. Cooke*, 2731–2736.

An officer on the Staff should be seconded in his regiment, *Sir C. Ellice*, 623, 624.

Would second officers at Staff College, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2330.

Would make all Artillery officers supernumerary who are employed extra-regimentally, except lieutenants, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3633.

Would second staff officers, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2250.

SECONDED AND SUPERNUMERARY OFFICERS—*cont.*

All officers appointed to Staff should be seconded, *Report*, p. xxv., sec. 28.

In **Austria** staff officers are supernumerary in regiments, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1832, 1834.

In **Germany**, an office appointed to staff is immediately replaced in his regiment, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 853.

SELECTION. *See* PROMOTION, 3.

SENIORITY. *See* PROMOTION, 4.

SERVICE, MILITARY.

In **France** compulsory on everybody, *Col. Conolly*, 1228, 1245–1254, 1330–1334, 1377, 1405–1408.

SERVICE IN THE RANKS.

Half should count towards retirement, *Report*, p. xvii.

SERVICE FOR PROMOTION.

1. *Generally.*
2. *Colonel.*
3. *Lieutenant-Colonel.*
4. *Major.*
5. *Captain.*

1. *Generally.*

Deprecates a positive standard; but the authorities would exercise discretion as to promoting a very young officer, *Duke of Cambridge*, 48–52, 207. Would not increase the present minimum, *ib.*, 80. If a limit were fixed, it would be inconvenient to let officers serve on unpromoted beyond it, *ib.* 121.

Two years home service should count as one year's foreign, *Maj. Hudson*, 3121, 3122.

Service of officers in former purchase regiments in 1871 and 1875, *App. D.*, p. 227.

In **Prussia**, no minimum, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 1091.

2. *Colonel.*

Increase of qualifying service from three to five years was prejudicial, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2173.

In **Prussia** during peace three or four years after becoming lieutenant-colonel, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 836.

3. *Lieutenant-Colonel.*

Should not be under 15 years, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2353.

Should be (in Artillery) after 24 years, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3689.

Seven or eight years ought to qualify for command of a regiment, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3309–3313. In peace an officer should not have much over 20 years before getting a regiment, *ib.*, 3315, 3316.

In **Prussia** during peace after 23 to 28 years service, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 834, 835.

4. *Major.*

Would not have a minimum for field officer; but a maximum after which officer should be ineligible, *Sir R. Airey*, 288–291.

Field officer not under 10 years, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson* 2351–2353.

Would require 12 to 13 years, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 3039.

Should be after 16 years in Artillery, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3689.

In **Prussia**, in peace, after 18 to 22 years, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 832, 833.

5. *Captain.*

Would require six years for captain, *Lieut.-Col. Maclean*, 3037, 3038.

A man should be captain (Artillery) after 10 years, *Col. Radcliffe*, 3689.

In **France**, often not till after 30 years' service, *Col. Conolly*, 1168, 1174, 1179.

In **Prussia**, after 11 or 12 years, in peace, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 832.

Spain.

Promotion, pay, pension, &c., *Capt. F. Clarke*, *App. A.*, p. 221.

STAFF.

1. *Admission, Selection, &c.*
2. *Tenure.*

1. *Admission, Selection, &c.*

Would not limit to Staff College officers, *Sir J. Adye*, 2554. The army is the best school, *ib.*, 2555–2557; and our Staff officers the best in the world, *ib.*, 2663.

Filled by selection, *Sir R. Airey*, 304, 317–319. A field officer can be appointed without passing the Staff College, *ib.*, 427–429; and any officer may pass the examination without attending the college, *ib.*, 498.

Appointments should be disseminated as far as possible, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1488, 1489, 1579, 1606, 1664.

Would limit to officers who had been at Staff College, except for service in field, *Maj. R. Buller*, 2858–2861

Staff—*cont.*

A term of staff appointment should enable an officer to return to his regiment in a higher rank, *ib.*, 2901–2904.

Appoints to junior grades from officers who have passed the Staff College, in turn: for higher grades makes his own selection, *Duke of Cambridge*, 59, 60, 81. Would prefer to select direct from regiments, *ib.*, 56–58, 209. In case of active service, should always take the best men, irrespective of their former Staff service, *ib.*, 88.

Staff College students should get Staff posts, *Capt. W. Cooke*, 2706, 2708, or a sufficient money prize, *ib.*, 2757; though some lower Staff positions might be held by men less highly educated, *ib.*, 2707.

When commanding a regiment, could not have picked out an officer fit for staff employment other than as aide-de-camp, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2375, 2376.

Would not limit to those who pass Staff College, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2245, 2246. Majors should be more employed on the Staff, *ib.*, 2075, 2249. Officers to command Indian brigades should be selected and sent out, *ib.*, 2254.

The condition of entrance should be the passing certain examinations rather than passing the Staff College, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1865, 1866, 1866*a*, 1950, 2016, 2017.

Regiment is best school of staff training, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3317–3321, 3390–3392.

Recommendations as to officers serving on Staff, *Report*, **p. xxv.**

In **Austria**, selected from pupils who have passed the War School, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1831, 1836, 1837, 1840. The duty does not give increased pay, *ib.*, 1838.

In **France**, a separate corps, *Col. Conolly*, 1366, 1367, 1369–78. A source of great dissatisfaction in the army, *ib.*, 1368.

Prussian system of selecting officers for, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 855, 861, 862, 940–947, 982.

2. *Tenure.*

Would adhere to five years' rule, with occasional exceptions, *Sir J. Adye*, 2551–2553.

Five years' limit, should be adhered to in peace, as distributing more widely the knowledge of Staff duties, *Sir R. Airey*, 320–329.

Approves the five years' limit during peace, with a large discretion as to re-appointments, *Duke of Cambridge*, 82–87.

Five-years' rule should be adhered to, the officer returning to regimental duty or half-pay, *Sir C. Ellice*, 586–589, 628–631.

An officer should return to his regiment after five years, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2074–2076, 2159–2161.

Would limit tenure during peace to five years, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1951.

Five years' limit good, *Lord Strathnairn*, 3322, 3323.

Five years limit to be maintained, and officers not to be re-appointed to Staff at the end of it, *Report*, **pp. xxxiii., xxxiv.**

In **Austria** Staff officers must return to regimental duty for two or three years before promotion, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1833, 1835; no other limit of tenure, *ib.*, 1838.

In **Germany**, no fixed term, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 852; but officers do not remain long without returning to regimental duty, *ib.*, 842–845, 979, 980.

Staff College.

1. *Generally.*
2. *Admission.*

1. *Generally.*

Would not increase facilities for attending, *Sir R. Airey*, 413–416, 498, 500–503; holds 40 officers, limited to captains and subalterns, *ib.*, 427, 428; the majority of students benefit, *ib.*, 422, 423.

Approves, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1561; but would not increase, *ib.*, 1567; the best regimental officers do not, as a rule, go there, *ib.*, 1562–1566.

No college could teach details of a staff office, *Major R. Buller*, 2930, 2931; it would benefit the army if the students were increased, *ib.*, 2871, 2872, 2885; in Ashantee, found benefit from college studies, *ib.*, 2910, 2911; though practical training was deficient, *ib.*, 2912.

Not opposed to, but would not extend, *Duke of Cambridge*, 209–214. Objects to give special seniority in virtue of passing, *ib.*, 54, 55.

Officers who have been at Woolwich could pass out in less than two years, *Captain F. Clarke*, 2820–2822; would not lower the standard, *ib.*, 2788, 2789, 2793.

Staff College—*cont.*

Men would not go to the College merely to take a sort of degree, *ib.*, 2804, 2806.

Military technical subjects and foreign languages carry most weight, *Capt. W. Cooke*, 2743, 2744.

Strong feeling in regiments against officers at, *Lieut. Gough*, 3248.

Would extend, *Lieut.-Gen. Hodgson*, 2329.

Would give all Sandhurst up to, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2156. Excellent, but not comprehensive enough, *ib.*, 2060. Would prefer a lower standard and at least 100 students, *ib.*, 2061, 2067, 2145; with a more professional course, *ib.*, 2146, 2148, 2149. Passing should be its own reward, without claim to promotion or staff service, *ib.*, 2062–2066, 2150, 2151, 2252; but would give scholarships, *ib.*, 2150–2153. The education is in itself a great gain, *ib.*, 2067. Would change name to "Military" or "Army" College, *ib.*, 2158. The Indian staff has been formed without a staff college, but the majority of those men had had considerable professional education, *ib.*, 2252.

In **Germany**, the War Academy takes its place, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 856–873, 977, 982, 983, 1020, 1035, 1040.

2. *Admission.*

Entrance is competitive, and there are always plenty of candidates, *Sir R. Airey*, 418–420. Would rather nominate direct to College on the report of the commanding officer, *ib.*, 424–426, 430, 431, 504.

Commanding officers should select officers to go through the College, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1584-1595.

A month's cramming cost him 40*l.*, *Maj. R. Buller*, 2838–2841. More care needed in selecting those who are to compete, *ib.*, 2866–2870, 2888. Would exclude subalterns, unless about to be promoted, *ib.*, 2929.

100 officers would enter annually if there were room, *Capt. F. Clarke*, 2826; which would be good for the service, *ib.*, 2827.

Men cram, *Capt. W. Cooke*, 2759. Would not diminish the tests, *ib.*, 2701–2703.

Selection for entrance should be more strict; commanding officers should pick out their best men, *Sir A. Horsford*, 702–706.

Admission should be limited by age, *Lord Sandhurst*, 2154–2155; the test turning on intellectual acquirements, *ib.*, 2068–2072.

Supersession.

Between Infantry and Artillery seems inevitable, *Maj.-Gen. Armstrong*, 1554.

More serious in upper than in lower grades, *Duke of Cambridge*, 3892. Between Artillery or Engineers and Line is not a great matter, *ib.*, 3925, 3926.

Incurable, unless the whole army be on one seniority list, which is undesirable, *Sir T. Pears*, 3552–3558. The amalgamation of the list of colonels prevents it in rank of generalofficer, *ib.*, 3453–3455. Speaking generally, is rather a good thing, *ib.*, 3498.

Would cease, injuriously, if all branches were similarly organised, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1973. It cannot otherwise be avoided, *ib.*, 1974–1977. A dead level not desirable, *ib.*, 1978.

Between different branches of the service should not in future be admitted as a grievance, *Report*, **pp. xxxiv., xxxv.**

Avoided, in **Prussia**, by keeping back one arm until another reaches its level, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 775, 776, 908.

Sweden.

Promotion, pay, &c., *Capt. W. Cooke*, *App. A.*, p. 221.

Switzerland.

Rates of pay, *App. A.*, p. 222.

T.

Tableau d'Avancement for **French** officers, *Col. Conolly*, 1155–1157.

Telegraph Service **would afford a valuable retirement for officers**, *Report*, **p. xiv.**

Tenure.

In **Austria** not aware of any restriction, *Lieut.-Col. Goodenough*, 1702.

In **France** no limit in any appointment, except the age of 62, *Col. Conolly*, 1379–1381.

In **Germany** no fixed term for any appointment, *Maj.-Gen. Walker*, 914, 915, 931, 1010–1012.

See also Staff, 2.

U.

UNATTACHED PROMOTION. *See* PROMOTION, 5.

United States.
Pay and pensions, *App. A.*, p. 223.

UNITS FOR PROMOTION. *See* PROMOTION, 6.

V.

VACANCIES.
Required to secure promotion at the rate under Purchase, *Actuaries, App. G.*, p. 239.

VESTED RIGHTS.
No new ones to be created, *Report*, p. xxxvii.

W.

WOOLWICH, *Final Examination.*
Is intellectual, but drill and athletics count, though not for much, *Sir J. L. Simmons*, 1993, 1994. No test for moral qualities, *ib.*, 2001.

LONDON:
Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

REPORT

TO THE ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF HER MAJESTY'S FORCES, BY THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF RECRUITING, UPON RECRUITING FOR THE REGULAR ARMY FOR THE YEAR 1875.

PRESENTED TO PARLIAMENT BY COMMAND OF HER MAJESTY.

Horse Guards, War Office,
1st January 1876.

I HAVE the honour to submit, for the information of His Royal Highness the Field-Marshal Commanding in Chief, the following Report on the Recruiting Service of the Army for the past year.

1. The establishment of the Regular Army for the year 1875-6, as voted by Parliament, was 178,423 men, exclusive of officers, being very nearly the same strength as for the previous year 1874-5, but slightly in excess. As during the past twelve months the country has enjoyed peace, and there have been no exceptional circumstances to affect the condition of the Army, a number of recruits, equal to that raised in 1874, would have been sufficient to meet all requirements. Such number, however, has not been raised.

2. The number of men who have joined the Service during the year 1875 is 18,494, as against 20,640 in 1874, and 17,194 in 1873. There has consequently been a falling off in the numbers raised in the past year to the amount of 2,146 recruits, as compared with 1874; and the Army in the aggregate is now 897 men below establishment.

3. This deficiency may be traced to the slackness of recruiting in the spring of the year, during which time the number of men raised was below the average as compared with other months; but no special reason can be assigned for this falling off except that there was a good demand for labour, and that the rate of wages obtainable was high in comparison with the pay of a soldier. This is the usual answer to inquiries on the subject, and there can be no doubt that the direct advantages now offered by a military career can no longer compete in the labour market with the prevailing rate of wages in civil life amongst the class from which recruits are ordinarily drawn. This is more especially to be observed as regards full-grown able-bodied men. The consequence is that the deficiency is noticeable in the Brigade of Guards and in the Royal Artillery for gunners; both these Arms of the Service demanding men of a higher standard and of superior physique generally to the ordinary recruits.

4. Great care has also been taken to ensure a proper description of recruits; as may be inferred from the fact that upwards of 5,000 of those offering for enlistment were rejected as ineligible; and it is an inevitable consequence that as quality improves so quantity decreases. This may in some degree account for the diminution in numbers.

5. The numbers raised for the Cavalry and Infantry of the Line have been sufficient to keep the Regiments and Brigades of those Arms of the Service up to the authorized establishments, the Cavalry of the Line having on the 1st January 1876 supernumeraries to the amount of 356, and the Infantry 634.

6. The Colonial Corps—viz., the two West India Regiments, the Malta Fencible Artillery, and the Gun Lascars in China and Ceylon—are, in the aggregate, 237 men below their establishments. The reason for this deficiency may be ascribed to local causes.

7. The Army Service Corps is complete to within four men; whilst the Army Hospital Corps, for which special qualifications are required, is deficient 61 men.

8. A description of the mode by which the Army is recruited was given in the Report submitted last year; but it may be considered desirable to explain again in detail the machinery now in operation.

9. The Military districts of Great Britain and Ireland are sub-divided into 66 Sub-Districts for Infantry, 12 for Artillery, and 2 for Cavalry. The Infantry Sub-Districts in England, as a rule, correspond geographically with the several counties of which the

[C.—1435.] *Price* 1*d.*

Kingdom is composed; the exceptions being the large and populous counties of Yorkshire and Lancashire, which are sub-divided into seven Sub-Districts each; Staffordshire, Kent, and Surrey into two each. On the other hand, small and adjacent counties, such as Oxford and Bucks, are combined into one Sub-District. The thinly-populated Welsh counties are also combined; the whole principality being comprised in three Sub-Districts.

10. In Scotland, likewise, with the exception of Lanarkshire, which is divided into two Sub-Districts, the several Sub-Districts comprise each more than one county.

11. Ireland is partitioned into eight Sub-Districts in like manner.

12. Each Infantry Sub-District contains a Brigade Depôt, commanded by an experienced Officer not below the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, who superintends and directs the Recruiting Service for his Brigade as well as, when so ordered, for other Corps.

13. These Commanding Officers of Infantry Sub-Districts have at their disposal for recruiting purposes:—

The Brigade Depôt.

The Staff of all Infantry Militia Battalions, belonging to the Sub-District, not at the Head-Quarters of the Brigade Depôt.

Adjutants and Serjeant Instructors of Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Special Recruiting parties detached from the other Arms of the Service—viz., Cavalry, Artillery, Guards, and Rifles; also the Staff Officers of Pensioners, and the paid pensioners acting under them.

The London and Dublin Recruiting Districts are still preserved, as formerly; being considered outside the localization system. This is found (especially in London) to be essential in obtaining men who would not otherwise be enlisted. These two establishments are under the superintendence of Assistant Adjutants-General, acting as Inspecting Field Officers.

14. In addition to these recruiting agencies, men are also taken at the Head-Quarters of Regiments, Battalions, and Corps, and passed into the Service by the several Commanding Officers.

15. No changes of system have been introduced during the past year. It only remains, therefore, to be stated, that whereas on the 1st of January 1875, there were 33 Brigade Depôts "formed" and in full operation, the number up to the present date has been increased to 37, shewing an addition of four during the last 12 months. In the course of the present year it is anticipated that in 11 more Sub-Districts the necessary buildings will be completed, making up the number of these establishments to 48 by the beginning of next year.

16. The scheme for carrying out the principle of local organization is thus annually becoming nearer completion, and in the year 1878 the period will arrive when the system may receive a full and fair trial.

17. In analysing the returns from the several Sub-Districts, of the number of recruits raised within their respective limits, the results will be found to be very variable. In some Sub-Districts a number has been obtained considerably in excess of what was required to keep the Linked-Battalions of the Brigade up to their establishment; the surplus in such cases passing to other Brigades in want of men. In certain others, the supply has been about equal to the demand; but in several Sub-Districts the deficiency has been very apparent—notably in counties on the seaboard, and in remote parts of the United Kingdom.

18. The degree in which localization has promoted recruiting is not easy to ascertain, but in one respect there has been a good result, inasmuch, that, in nearly all cases, the Militia Corps of the Sub-Districts have provided, during or after the annual training, a fair number of Volunteers for the affiliated Battalions of the Line.

19. And here it may be remarked that the Sub-Districts which comprise sections of the country containing a population chiefly employed in agricultural pursuits have not, so far, contributed recruits in numbers equivalent to those raised in the manufacturing and mining districts. Thus the men who have lately joined the Army have been procured in a greater proportion from the large towns, and the great centres of population.

20. The result appears to be that, though the recruits obtained in towns and manufacturing districts may not be on the whole physically such eligible men as those raised

from amongst the agricultural classes, yet they are stated to be intellectually, and as regards educational attainments, superior.

21. The regulations of standard under which recruits are now accepted for the Regular Army are as follows :—

	Age.	Height.	Chest Measurement.
For Cavalry	18 to 25	5 ft. 6 ins. and upwards	33 to 35 ins. according to height.
Royal Artillery—			
Gunners	18 to 25	5 ft. 7 ins. and upwards	33 to 35 ins. according to height.
Drivers	19 to 25	5 ft. 4½ ins. to 5 ft. 6½ ins.	35 ins.
Royal Engineers	18 to 25	5 ft. 6 ins. and upwards	Same as Cavalry.
Infantry	18 to 25	5 ft. 5 ins. and upwards	Same as Cavalry.
Rifle Corps	18 to 25	5 ft. 4½ ins. to 5 ft. 7 ins.	34 ins. minimum.

22. For the accuracy of these figures the Officer who passes the recruit into the Service is responsible; and he is assisted in this duty by the opinion and advice of the Medical Officer who makes the final medical examination. Occasionally, instances occur in which recruits make false statements as to age, in order to ensure enlistment; and sometimes they succeed in deceiving the most experienced officials. In any case of doubt, the approving or Commanding Officer must exercise his discretion as to approval or rejection; and, as a rule, the decisions evince good judgment and discernment. A certain number of boys and lads are also enlisted, to be trained as drummers, musicians, and tailors. These will form the subject of further remark.

23. The periods of service for which recruits are at present engaged for the different Arms of the Service are as under:—

I. Cavalry .. .. { Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service; or Short Service, *i.e.*, for 8 years Army Service, and 4 years Reserve Service.

II. Artillery .. .. { Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service; or Short Service, *i.e.*, for 8 years Army Service, and 4 years Reserve Service.

III. Engineers .. .. { Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service; or Short Service, *i.e.*, for 8 years Army Service, and 4 years Reserve Service.

IV. Infantry .. .. { Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service; or Short Service, *i.e.*, for 6 years Army Service, and 6 years Reserve Service.

V. Army Service Corps .. { Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service; or Short Service, *i.e.*, for 6 years Army Service, and 6 years Reserve Service.

VI. Army Hospital Corps . Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service.

VII. Colonial Corps .. Long Service, *i.e.*, for 12 years Army Service.

24. Under existing regulations, the proportions in which enlistments for long and short service respectively are made in the several branches of the Service are as follows, viz. :—

	Long.	Short.
Household Troops { Cavalry	All	—
Household Troops { Infantry	Optional	—
Cavalry of the Line	25 per cent.	75 per cent.
Royal Artillery	Optional	—
Royal Engineers	—	All
Infantry of the Line	25 per cent.	75 per cent
Army Service Corps	50 per cent.	50 per cent
Army Hospital Corps	All	—
Colonial Corps	All	—

25. Within such limits as may from time to time be prescribed, soldiers may, on the recommendation of their Commanding Officers, and with their own free assent, after three years' Army service, pass to the Reserve, to complete in that Force the unexpired portion of their engagement. Those enlisted for short service who are non-commissioned officers, musicians, artificers, or men likely to make good non-com-

missioned officers, may, at any time after the expiration of their first three years' service in the Army, if specially recommended, extend their Army service to complete 12 years with the Colours. Any soldier who, being in Army service, has commenced the 12th year from his first enlistment, or who, being within three years of the expiration of his first enlistment, and in Army service, has been ordered, but has not yet proceeded on foreign service, may, with the approval of his Commanding Officer, be re-engaged so as to complete 21 ye rs' service; at the conclusion of which he becomes entitled to pension.

26. Judging from the reports received from Officers Commanding Corps on home service, it may be asserted that the recruits who have joined the Army during the past year are, on the whole, of a fairly good type, and of a somewhat better description than those raised in the previous two years; and this opinion is corroborated by the reports furnished monthly by the Principal Medical Officers at the several garrisons and chief stations throughout the kingdom; the number of objections raised by them at their inspections having been comparatively few.

27. It has been stated above that the numbers raised for Cavalry and Infantry of the Line have been sufficient to supply the casualties in those Arms of the Service, and to keep the number of their effectives up to the authorized Establishment; but it must be borne in mind that, towards the close of the present year, the effect of the short service enlistments introduced in the autumn of 1870 will begin to be felt, and in the course of the year 1877 the system will be more in operation. Large numbers of men, therefore, whose engagements are for six years with the Colours and six with the Reserve, will be passing into this latter force; and their places in the ranks of the active Army will require to be filled by others. It is calculated that, for the present year, the additional number that will be required, beyond the usual casualties, will not exceed 1,000 or 1,200 men; but, in the following year, the demand will be much greater, amounting probably to 7,000 or 8,000 men; a condition of affairs that may be assumed to be permanent, thus rendering it necessary, in future, to raise yearly from 27,000 to 28,000 men to keep the Army, at its present Establishment, complete in numbers. It has already been shewn that in the Royal Artillery, and the Brigade of Guards, the deficiency in point of numbers is even this year apparent, and as there is reason to believe that all officials connected with recruiting have used their best endeavours, in their several positions, to procure eligible men for the Service, it has become manifest that some additional inducements must be offered to the classes of the community from which our soldiers have hitherto been chiefly obtained, in order to enable a military career to compete more equally with the advantages afforded by civil life.

28. It may be taken for granted that no system of conscription, or compulsory service is likely to find favour in this country, and that therefore the principle of voluntary enlistment must continue in force; but, in the present prosperous condition of the country as regards the rate of wages, the existing advantages, direct and indirect, which together form the remuneration offered to a soldier, are evidently insufficient to attract to the ranks men physically and intellectually suitable for service in sufficient numbers to supply our requirements.

29. The total number of men who have joined the several Arms of the Service during the year 1875 is as follows:—

	Long Service.	Short Service.	Total.
Household Cavalry	127	—	127
Cavalry of the Line	823	1,753	2,576
Royal Artillery..	1,699	1,469	3,168
Royal Engineers	47	457	504
Foot Guards	357	353	710
Infantry of the Line	2,043	8,977	11,020
Colonial Corps	108	9	117
Army Service Corps	132	126	258
Army Hospital Corps	13	1	14
Total	5,349	13,145	18,494

30. It is probable that, as the system of localization becomes more perfect, the Militia may be made one of the chief feeders of the Regular Army. Already many excellent recruits are obtained from that source during or at the end of the annual training; and if a regular quota from each Militia regiment could be supplied for its

affiliated Infantry Brigade, a great step in advance would be taken towards furnishing the number of recruits required under the short-service system of enlistment. It would be desirable, however, that the volunteers thus passed from this force into the Line should, if possible, be men of mature age, suitable not only for service in the Battalions on home service, but in all respects fit for Indian and other foreign service, and thus in some degree meet the complaints that are frequently made as to the youth of our ordinary recruits.

31. It is believed that by offering inducements, either in the form of bounty or of assured additional deferred pay, a considerable number of eligible men may thus be procured; but, at the same time, it must be remembered that the Militia force throughout the country is at present much below its authorized strength, and that recruits are enrolled in it at an earlier age and of a lower standard than the Regulations for the Regular Army require. It is consequently apparent that, in order to carry out such measures as are here proposed, it would be necessary to alter or amend the system upon which the Militia is now raised; so as to ensure at every annual training a full complement on the rolls of each Corps.

32. The regiments of Militia Artillery might in like manner supply the requirements of the Royal Artillery.

33. It would, no doubt, be most desirable if none but full-grown men of 20 years and upwards were enlisted as soldiers; but the simple fact is, that in the present prosperous condition of the labouring classes, a military career does not offer sufficient advantages to men of that stamp who have already entered upon trades, professions, and other avocations: so that, unless higher inducements are set forth, a large proportion of recruits must continue to be furnished from the youths of from 18 to 19 years of age, who have not settled down into any fixed mode of occupation, or who have failed in obtaining a livelihood by regular labour.

34. The short-service system brings into prominence the youth of our soldiers, more especially in the Corps on home service, which it may be said are now only training schools for the Army abroad and for the Reserve. The theory of the scheme is, that these Battalions, composed in a great measure of very young men, and restricted to a reduced Establishment, shall in the event of war or sudden emergency be filled from the Reserve; the men thus joining being all trained soldiers in the prime of life who have already passed from three to six years in the ranks. This plan has not yet been put to a practical test, for the very good reason that since the introduction of short-service enlistments, in the latter part of the year 1870, sufficient time has not elapsed to allow any considerable number of men to pass into the Reserve. When the numbers reach a substantial total, it will certainly be desirable to see how the theory may be reduced to practice. Whilst admitting that men of full age, and not lads of 18, are preferable as soldiers, it must be remembered that for many years, certainly from before the beginning of the present century, the age of 18 has been held to be that at which a youth is fit to do duty in the ranks and to be counted as a man; and the records of celebrated campaigns prove that many such rendered good service: but the changes in the constitution and organization of Continental armies render it perilous for this country to rely to so great an extent as formerly upon its undeveloped manhood.

35. As an additional means of furnishing the increased supply of recruits which it has been shewn will in future be required, it has been strongly urged that the practice of enlisting boys from the several industrial, district, union, and other schools shall be still further extended. At present only a limited number of boys in excess of the number authorized as band-boys, drummers, &c., are allowed to be taken for training in Regiments, Brigades, and Corps; and this for the very cogent reason that each boy thus enlisted counts as one of the Establishment, and is thus reckoned amongst the effective sabres or bayonets. But if authority were given for the enlistment of a larger number of boys *in excess of the Establishment*, to be retained at the Depôts or at their present schools until they reached the age of 17 or 18 years, during which time they should attend to study, be instructed in trades (this should be imperative), and thoroughly drilled, besides being put through a course of gymnastics, it is believed that a very valuable element would be introduced into the Army, and that from this source many good non-commissioned officers especially would be obtainable, supplying thus a want from which many Corps are now reported to suffer. From information that has been received, it would appear that any number of such boys may be obtained; and if the principle were adopted and the proposal reduced to a system there is no doubt that a regular flow of young men of a superior stamp would be added to the Service, aiding in a large degree towards filling the vacancies that will occur from the constant passing of short-service men into the Reserve, and supplementing in a most satisfactory manner the ordinary recruiting of the Army.

36. A considerable expense would certainly be incurred in the first instance; but, looking at the question from an Imperial point of view, it may be assumed that other Departments of the State would be benefited to a corresponding extent.

37. In order to induce a higher class of the community to enter the Service, and to remain in it, it would appear to be necessary to make the prizes of the profession more alluring; and with this view it is very desirable that the dignity and emoluments of non-commissioned officers should be increased, and that all ranks of that valuable and deserving class, from the Regimental Serjeant-Major downwards, including those holding lance rank, should receive more pay whilst serving, and possibly for those who complete their full term of 21 years a corresponding addition to pension on discharge.

38. As regards Desertion, it is satisfactory to be able to state that the returns for the past year shew a decided improvement in this respect.

39. In 1874 the number of desertions reported amounted to 5,572; whilst in 1875 their number has fallen to 4,382; a result which may be considered as a proof that the class of men joining the Army is improving, or that those serving are more satisfied generally with their position and prospects. There can be no doubt that many of these acts of desertion are repeated by the same individual; and that a regular system of desertion, and subsequent fraudulent re-enlistment, is carried on by a certain class of men who make a trade of this offence, and who have no intention or desire of permanently serving. These men are a most serious detriment to the Army; as, during the short time they remain in any corps, they are not only useless themselves, but they exercise a most contaminating influence on the young soldiers with whom they are brought in contact, and by their example lead others into crime.

40. Any measure that would tend to diminish the prevalence of this offence would be a boon to the Service, and be most beneficial to the interests of recruiting generally.

41. Since the abolition of the practice of marking such offenders, it is notorious that the crime of fraudulent enlistment has greatly increased, and if it be still considered undesirable to revert to that method of prevention, it is suggested, as proposed on a former occasion, that some system of marking by vaccination should be adopted, which, while not attaching a stigma to the individual, will render such fraudulent enlistments if not impossible, at least, extremely difficult.

42. There are two other forms of fraudulent enlistment—viz., 1st. Men not deserters, but who have already served and have been discharged from the Service for bad conduct or for physical unfitness, and who deny their previous service when offering for enlistment. (The special marking above alluded to would equally apply to these cases.) 2nd. Men who make false statements as to their age in order to come within the prescribed conditions of enlistment laid down by regulation. These cases can only be met by extreme care and discrimination on the part of the recruiters; and the law as at present existing appears to be sufficient to punish such offenders.

43. A return is annexed, shewing the causes of increase and decrease in the Army monthly during the year 1875.

R. C. H. TAYLOR, *Major-General,*
Inspector-General of Recruiting.

Increase and Decrease of the Army reported during each Month of the Year 1875.

	Non-Commissioned Officers and Men—All Arms.												
	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	Total since commencement of the year.
Effectives on the 1st of the Month	178,276	178,583	178,025	177,452	176,654	176,103	175,799	175,842	175,755	175,495	175,432	175,632	175,856 (On 1st Jan. 1876.)
Increase.													
Recruits Joined. Long Service	461	426	376	390	487	548	557	440	360	436	437	431	5,349
Recruits Joined. Short Service	1,215	1,027	774	696	830	1,166	1,406	1,313	1,133	1,216	1,225	1,144	13,145
	1,676	1,453	1,150	1,086	1,317	1,714	1,963	1,753	1,493	1,652	1,662	1,575	18,494
Joined from Desertion ..	196	159	190	145	180	157	163	150	148	152	144	160	1,944
From Army Reserve ..	1	..	..	1	3	..	1	..	1	1	1	2	11
Other Causes	25	46	69	70	86	54	36	23	7	3	22	10	*451
Total Increase ..	1,898	1,658	1,409	1,302	1,586	1,925	2,163	1,926	1,649	1,808	1,829	1,747	20,900
Decrease.													
Dead	187	146	174	184	181	156	164	219	171	209	201	169	2,161
Discharged: After 21 years' service	87	212	246	284	253	269	206	248	193	149	229	245	2,621
Discharged: After 18 years' service under Art. 1115 of Royal Warrant of 27th Dec. 1870.	..	1	2	4	4	2	6	12	4	3	2	1	41
Discharged: As Invalids.. ..	208	256	208	330	390	480	410	311	237	345	168	181	3,524
Discharged: On completing 1st period	184	605	274	230	194	187	225	197	162	130	185	154	2,727
Discharged: By Purchase ..	185	221	267	265	282	253	253	242	259	241	198	181	2,847
Discharged: Free by Indulgence	43	91	61	35	69	84	67	53	33	32	23	29	620
Discharged: For Misconduct ..	148	113	136	168	182	123	122	155	153	129	134	104	1,667
Discharged: Miscellaneous ..	23	11	26	13	10	16	19	8	15	16	17	14	188
	878	1,510	1,220	1,329	1,384	1,414	1,308	1,226	1,056	1,045	956	909	14,235
Deserted	319	353	346	307	345	470	367	402	481	373	312	307	4,382
To Army Reserve ..	45	11	27	105	51	50	152	24	85	103	21	38	712
Given up as Deserters ..	48	48	51	52	46	51	41	46	50	47	31	38	549
Other Causes	114	148	164	123	130	88	88	96	66	94	108	62	*1,281
Total Decrease ..	1,591	2,216	1,982	2,100	2,137	2,229	2,120	2,013	1,909	1,871	1,629	1.523	23,320
Nett Increase	307	..	..	..	..	..	43	..	..	..	200	224	..
Nett Decrease	..	558	573	798	551	304	..	87	260	63	..	..	2,120

* Principally interchanges between the different branches of the service.

REPORT to the ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF HER MAJESTY'S FORCES, by the INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF RECRUITING, upon RECRUITING for the REGULAR ARMY for the Year 1875.

(Presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty).

PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY HARRISON AND SONS.

[1750—2 | 76—85WO.]

REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF VISITORS

APPOINTED FOR THE YEAR 1876,

TO INSPECT

THE ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY HARRISON AND SONS.

1876.

[C.—1614.] *Price* 1*d.*

No. $\frac{7851}{1093}$

Military Education Division, War Office,
30th May 1876.

Sir,

The Secretary of State for War having been pleased to appoint a Board of Visitors consisting of yourself as President, Major-General H. Scott, C.B., the Right Rev. the Chaplain-General, and Sir Walter Barttelot, Bart., M.P., for the purpose of making the annual inspection of the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, which was recommended by the Royal Commission on Military Education in the following terms:—"Finally, we "recommend that an annual inspection of the College, both in regard to its discipline "and the instruction it administers, should be made by an independent Board of Visitors "appointed by the Secretary of State, and that their Report shall be presented to "Parliament," I have the honour to request you to communicate with your colleagues, and with the Governor of the Royal Military Academy, with a view to arranging the most convenient time for the inspection to take place.

I am to request that you will communicate freely with the Governor, and ascertain his views upon all matters to which the Board consider it necessary to refer in their Report.

The Report of the Board will be made to the Secretary of State for War, and will be presented to Parliament, in accordance with Art. 17 of the accompanying "General Regulations" for the Royal Military Academy.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
E. H. F. Pocklington,
Director-General of Military Education.

To Lieut.-General Sir John St. George, K.C.B., Royal Artillery,
&c. &c. &c.

Art. 17. "An independent inspection by a Board of Visitors, appointed by the "Secretary of State for War, and reporting to him, will be made once a year. Such "Visitors will not be a permanent body, but will not be all changed at the same time. "The Report of this Board will be presented to Parliament."

Report of the Board of Visitors appointed for the year 1876, to Inspect the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich.

As the Board of Visitors appointed by War Office Letter, No. $\frac{7851}{1093}$, dated the 30th May 1876, we have the honour to make the following Report of our inspection of the Royal Military Academy on the 19th and 20th of June 1876:—

We have received every assistance and information from Major-General Sir John Adye, the Governor, and from every person whom we thought it advisable to consult. We are of opinion that the Institution is in every respect in a very satisfactory condition, that the general management is good, that the departments are well conducted, and that the tone and bearing of the Cadets are all that could be desired.

Mathematics.

The Professor of Mathematics thinks he may say that there is an improvement in the mathematical knowledge of the Cadets since the new system of marks has been adopted. This system has, however, only been in operation at the last two entrance examinations; and its effect has not, of course, been as yet fully tried. He suggests that elementary conic sections should be considered an obligatory subject of instruction in the Academy. The Board concur in this recommendation.

Fortification.

The Professor of Fortification is quite satisfied with his branch of the Cadets' instruction. He suggests one improvement, viz., that as the Classes go to Shoeburyness for a little gunnery instruction, so they should be sent down to Chatham for a day, at the period when siege operations are being carried on, and thus obtain a small insight into the Engineers' duty. The Board agree in the advisability of this step.

Artillery.

We have no observation to make on this subject. The Professor of Artillery is content with the progress made by the Cadets.

German and French.

The Professors of French and German are anxious that their casual assistant instructors, who seem to be employed at the Academy without intermission, should be placed on the staff of the Establishment. The Board refrain from offering any opinion on this question.

Sanitary Condition.

The Medical Officer reports very satisfactorily of the health of the Academy. He thinks that the situation, the mode of life, and the large proportion of out-door employment are all in its favour. He thus finds that boys, after joining the Academy, improve in health considerably. The diet is liberal and wholesome. At present there are three in hospital, out of a total of 204; the average number is about $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

There has been very little infectious disease. There was one case of measles in the Cadet Hospital; the second case was at once removed to the Herbert Hospital; and he

considers that it is better to remove such cases to that hospital than to have a ward for them in the Cadet Hospital.

The Board find that the drains from the Academy are, excepting in so far as a check is afforded by ordinary trapping, in direct communication with the sewers of the town of Woolwich. Although they cannot point to any case in which disease has been occasioned in the Academy from noxious sewer gases, they are of opinion that the precaution should be taken of making a break in the continuity of the sewer which connects the Academy drains with the sewerage system of the town.

Drill and Discipline.

The Governor tells us that he finds no difficulty in maintaining a proper respect for authority, and the officers and under officers whom we consulted were equally satisfied with the obedience that is paid to their orders.

Referring to the recommendation of the last Board of Visitors, that there should be an intermediate authority between the Governor and the Cadets for the punishment of minor offences committed during the hours of study, the Board are happy to find that Sir John Adye has carried out the spirit of the recommendation investing with that authority the Captain of the Company.

Messing.

The mess arrangements appear to us to be very good, and to give satisfaction to the Cadets generally. In accordance with the recommendation of the last Board, the Governor has put a Cadet of each Class, elected by the Classes themselves, upon the Mess Committee. This appears to work well. The dining-hall is too small for the ordinary number of Cadets at the Academy and at present there are some 25 over that number. It has therefore been necessary to move the A Division (about 40) into another room, where they mess by themselves.

The Board consider that this room is neither large enough, nor of the character that Cadets of the A Class are entitled to expect; and now that additions and alterations are about to be made in the Academy Buildings, it would seem a favourable opportunity to provide a proper room.

Recreation.

Additional ground for cricket and other out of door sports has been enclosed, and there is now nothing to be desired in that respect. We are of opinion that a Fives Court, behind the Gymnasium, would be a very welcome addition, and that its cost would be comparatively small, as some of the walls necessary already exist. Racquets are no longer played on Sundays.

Accommodation.

The want of sufficient accommodation, pointed out by previous Boards of Visitors, is in course of being supplied. We are happy to find that a grant on account has been taken. We understand that the additional rooms contemplated will only be sufficient to give one room to each Cadet when the Academy contains its ordinary number. At present that number is considerably exceeded. Nothing has yet been done to provide accommodation for the servants.

General Remarks.

An extra number of Commissions being required for the Royal Artillery, the Governor has been obliged to push on a certain proportion of each Class with accelerated promotion. These cadets will get their commissions in two years instead of two and a half years.

Sir John Adye thinks that the stay of all cadets at the Academy might be shortened to two years. The Board do not feel competent to express any opinion on this point. If it could be done without injury to the cadet, it would certainly tend to remedy the pecuniary disadvantage under which he labours in comparison with the candidate for the Line.

To these disadvantages the attention of the Board has been naturally drawn. We think that the Royal Military Academy has, from the following causes, lost some of its attractions for the public, and we agree in the opinions held by the Governor on this subject :—

1st. In time; the Woolwich cadet, on receiving his commission, being, on an average, a year older than the Line Officer.

2nd. In money; the Artillery and Engineer Officer having before joining cost his parents on the average 240*l.* more than the Line Officer. As Sandhurst is to be made a Cadet College, where youths are to remain one year, these two disadvantages will be, to a certain extent, modified.

3rd. In education; the requirements for, and at, the Academy being greater than those for Sandhurst.

And besides these considerations, it is probable that the fact that officers of the Artillery and Engineers are much less frequently employed in high commands, or on the general staff of the Army, than those of other branches of the Service, would exercise considerable influence in the selection of a future career.

JOHN St. GEORGE, *Lieut.-General.*
PIERS C. CLAUGHTON, *Bishop, C.G.*
WALTER B. BARTTELOT.
HENRY Y. D. SCOTT, *Major-General.*

[875—9/76—558wo]

FOURTEENTH REPORT

OF THE

ROYAL COMMISSIONERS

OF THE

PATRIOTIC FUND

TO

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

1875.

Being the Seventh Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Supplementary Commission, dated the 26th March, 1868.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. CLOWES & SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS,
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

[C.—1378.] Price 7*d.*

ROYAL COMMISSIONERS.

President,

FIELD-MARSHAL HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, K.G.

His Grace the DUKE of SOMERSET, K.G.
Lieutenant-General His Grace the DUKE of WELLINGTON, K.G.
The Most Noble the MARQUIS of RIPON, K.G.
Admiral the Right Honourable the EARL of LAUDERDALE, G.C.B.
The Right Honourable the EARL of CHICHESTER.
The Right Honourable the EARL NELSON.
The Right Honourable the EARL GREY.
The Right Honourable LORD PETRE.
General the Right Honourable LORD ROKEBY, K.C.B.
The Right Honourable LORD CHELMSFORD.
The Right Honourable LORD ACTON.
The Right Honourable LORD WAVENEY.
The Right Honourable LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.
Colonel the Right Honourable LORD WINMARLEIGH.
The Right Honourable B. DISRAELI, M.P.
The Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.
Lieutenant-General the Right Honourable JONATHAN PEEL.
Lieutenant-General the Right Honourable SIR EDWARD LUGARD, G.C.B.
The Right Honourable J. G. HUBBARD, M.P.
The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR.
General SIR RICHARD JAMES DACRES, G.C.B.
General SIR ANTHONY B. STRANSHAM, K.C.B., R.M.
Admiral W. A. BAILLIE HAMILTON.
General HENRY EYRE.
Major-General JOHN HENRY LEFROY, R.A., C.B.
JOHN BALL, Esq.

EXECUTIVE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Chairman,

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD HAMPTON, G.C.B.

ARMSTRONG, SIR ALEXANDER, K.C.B., M.D., LL.D.
CAMOYS, THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD.
CHAPMAN, LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR FREDERICK E., K.C.B., R.E.
CODRINGTON, ADMIRAL SIR HENRY J., K.C.B.
CRAUFURD, GENERAL J. R.
DACRES, GENERAL SIR RICHARD J., G.C.B.
GIBBS, F. W., ESQ., C.B.
HAMILTON, ADMIRAL W. A. BAILLIE.
LEFROY, MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN HENRY, C.B., R.A.
LOWDER, MAJOR-GENERAL S. N., C.B., R.M.
MAITLAND, MAJOR-GENERAL CHARLES L. B.
STRANSHAM, GENERAL SIR ANTHONY B., K.C.B., R.M.
TUFNELL, E. CARLETON, ESQ.
WAVENEY, THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD.
WILBRAHAM, GENERAL SIR RICHARD, K.C.B.
WOOLLEY, JOSEPH, ESQ., LL.D.

FIELD, CAPTAIN E., R.N.
BRENT, CAPTAIN H. W., R.N.
} *Members of the Executive Committee of the Patriotic Fund, for the purposes of the "Captain" Relief Fund.*

WM. H. MUGFORD, *Secretary to the Royal Commission, and the Executive and Finance Committee.*

3, *St. Martin's Place, Trafalgar Square.*

CONTENTS.

	Paragraph.	Page.	Appendix.
Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure	..	..	C. & D.
Assets and Liabilities	8	8	F.
Boarding Institutions, Children in	5	8	A.
"Captain," H.M.S., Relief Fund	30	13	N.
Contributions, Amount of	2	5	
Education of Roman Catholic Children	9	8	
Inspectors of Schools, Reports	..	..	B.
Liabilities and Assets	8	..	F
Orphans of other Wars than the Russian prior to Gold Coast ..	11	9	
,, ,, ,, ,, ,, —Gold Coast	11	9	
Relief, Amount expended in	6	8	
,, Numbers of Widows and Orphans	4	6 & 7	
,, Orphans of other Wars than the Russian	11	9	
Rodriguez Fund	33	14	D.
Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum (for Girls)	12	9	E.
Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum (for Boys)	26	12	
Securities, Statement of	3	6	
Special Cases	10	8	
Widows and Orphans, Numbers of	4	6 & 7	

FOURTEENTH REPORT

OF THE

ROYAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE PATRIOTIC FUND

TO

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

Being the Seventh Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Supplementary Commission, dated the 26th March, 1868.

20*th July*, 1875.

---

1. We, Your Majesty's Commissioners for the administration of the Patriotic Fund (appointed under the Supplementary Commission, dated 26th of March, 1868), humbly submit to Your Majesty the Fourteenth Report, which shows the state of the Fund on the 31st of December, 1874.

2. The total amount of Contributions to the 31st of December, 1874, was £1,460,861 11*s.* 1*d.* Amount of Contributions.

Statement of Securities.

3. The following is a statement of the Securities of the Fund on the 31st of December, 1874:—

	Per Cent.	£	s.	d.	Annual Income. £
Turkish Government Bonds	4	24,600	0	0	984
East India Debentures	4	87,000	0	0	3,480
East India Stock Certificates	4	6,000	0	0	240
Canada Bonds	5	17,600	0	0	880
Railway Bonds.					
Great Indian Peninsular	4	8,800	0	0	352
Great Western	4	80,000	0	0	3,200
North-Eastern	4	40,000	0	0	1,600
North-Eastern Debenture Stock	4	20,000	0	0	800
East India Railway Stock Certificates	5	72,140	0	0	3,607
Great Eastern	4½	15,000	0	0	637
London and Brighton Railway Debenture Stock	4½	15,000	0	0	675
East India Railway Debentures	4	30,000	0	0	1,200
		£416,140	0	0	£17,655

Annuities.

Expiring	£	s.	d.	
5th January, 1876	3,405	0	0	
5th April, 1876	6,097	0	0	
5th April, 1885	16,900	8	4	
				26,402
Total Income				£44,057

Numbers in receipt of relief.

4. In the following Tables are shown the numbers of Widows and Orphans placed on the Books, and the changes which have taken place to the 31st of December, 1874:—

(*a.*) WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF OFFICERS.—To 31st December, 1874.

—	Placed on Books during the Year ending 31st December, 1874.	In Receipt of Allowances on the 31st Dec., 1874.		Deaths.			Allowances Discontinued from Age, &c.		
		Widows.	Remarried.	During 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.
Widows	—	122	21	7	35	42	—	—	—
Children who have lost one or both Parents	1	*99		1	27	28	27	281	308

* *Of whom* 18 *were in the Wellington College.*
7 „ *Royal Naval School.*
5 „ *Royal Naval Female School.*

And there were 52 *other Children of Officers in the receipt of Educational Allowances.*

(b.) NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, PRIVATES, AND SEAMEN.—To 31st December, 1874.

WIDOWS.

—	Placed on Books for Relief.			Remarriages.			Second Husband Dead.			Married Third Time.			Allowances Discontinued.						Allowances Restored.			Still without Allowances.
													Deaths.			Other Causes.						
	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	
Army	3	3,024	3,027	9	1,754	1,763	20	318	338	5	98	103	37	584	621	5	310	315	2	86	88	227
Navy	3	743	746	2	352	354	8	65	73	1	25	26	2	134	136	—	63	63	—	33	33	30
Totals . .	6	3,767	3,773	11	2,106	2,117	28	383	411	6	123	129	39	718	757	5	373	378	2	119	121	257

CHILDREN.

—	Placed on Books.			Deaths.			Allowances Discontinued on account of Age.			Those Children whose Allowances have been Discontinued on account of Age, were disposed of as follows:	Between 1st Jan., 1874, and 31st Dec., 1874.			Previously Reported.	Grand Totals.
	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	During Year ending 31st Dec., 1874.	Previously Reported.	Total.	—	Army.	Navy.	Total.		
Army . . .	7	3,928	3,935	5	503	508	39	3,182	3,221	Apprenticed to Trades	—	—	—	659	659
Navy . . .	2	1,162	1,164	4	147	151	15	947	962	Entered Domestic Service	25	12	37	1,354	1,391
										,, Army	3	—	3	84	87
										,, Navy and Merchant Service	—	1	1	128	129
										Above age	11	2	13	1,904	1,917
Totals . .	9	5,090	5,099	9	650	659	54	4,129	4,183	Totals	39	15	54	4,129	4,183

Children in Boarding Institutions.

5. The number of Children in Boarding Institutions at the end of the year was 824, inclusive of those in the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Girls. A list of the Schools in which Children of both sexes are maintained and educated is given in Appendix A, and the Reports of the Inspectors in Appendix B.

Amount expended in relief.

6. The total Sum expended in relief to the 31st December, 1874, was £1,395,225 1*s.* 3*d.*

Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure.

7. The Accounts of the Receipt and Expenditure of the General Fund, and that of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Girls, for the year 1874, are appended (Appendices C, D, and E).

Assets and Liabilities.

8. The usual Estimate of the Assets and Liabilities has been prepared by Mr. Finlaison (Appendix F), by which it appears that he estimates the available surplus at £30,344, after setting aside one-tenth of the Liabilities as a reserve to meet contingencies.

Future Education of Roman Catholic Children.]

9. In our Reports to Your Majesty for the years 1873 and 1874, we described the steps taken with the view of making provision from the available surplus for the future Education of Orphans of Roman Catholic Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines.

The opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown with respect to the proposed mode of making that provision, which had not been received at the date of the last of those two Reports, has since been laid before us, and we have acted on their advice.

The contemplated arrangements will absorb the apparently available surplus mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Special Cases.

i. e., *Orphans of Men who served in the Russian War, but whose deaths were not caused by it. The Parents must have been married prior to* 1861. N.B. *Admissions to this List were suspended by our Resolution of 8th July,* 1874.

Special Cases.

10. Under this description 384 Orphans of Officers had, to the 31st of December, 1874, been placed on the Books; and to 206 of them Educational Allowances had been granted.

In like manner 1815 Orphans of Non-Commissioned and Petty Officers, Private Soldiers, and Seamen had been placed on the Books, and 984 of them had been admitted to Schools.

These statements show additions, during the year 1874, to the numbers previously on the Books, of 51 Children of Officers, and 123 Children of Non-Commissioned and Petty Officers, Private Soldiers, and Seamen.

Our Resolution suspending further admission to the list of Special Cases was passed on 8th July, 1874, and the large addition to the numbers during the portion of the year preceding that Resolution, is sufficient evidence of the necessity of such a restricting regulation.

Orphans of other Wars—*Prior to Gold Coast.*

11. In this category 34 Children of Officers, and 2 Children of Non-Commissioned Officers continue in the receipt of allowances. Orphans of other Wars.

Orphans of other Wars—*Gold Coast.*

Allowances have been granted to 12 Children of Officers, and to 34 Children of Non-Commissioned and Petty Officers, Soldiers, Seamen, and Marines. Of the latter 1 has since died. Other Wars. Gold Coast.

Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Girls.

12. During the year 1874 the average number of Girls in the Asylum was 321. Girls' School.

Management.

13. Hitherto there has been a Lady Superintendent of the Girls' School, but the Executive Committee report to us that the question whether or not any other system might be better has, at various intervals, engaged their serious consideration, and that during the past winter they determined to place a married couple at the head of the Establishment. Notice to leave was therefore given to Mrs. Carr, and the Executive Committee appointed Mr. Richard Larcombe to be the Superintendent, and his wife to be the Matron of the Establishment. Their joint Salaries to be the same as that paid to Mrs. Carr, viz., £150 per annum.

Finance.

14. The following is a statement of the Securities belonging to the Asylum on the 31st of December, 1874 :—

	Per Cent.	£	s.	d.	Annual Income. £
Dominion Debentures, viz. Canada	6	30,000	0	0	1,800
Dominion Debentures, viz. „	6	6,300	0	0	378
Dominion Debentures, viz. New Brunswick	6	5,000	0	0	300
South Australian Government Debentures (Adelaide and Gawler Town Railway)	6	10,000	0	0	600
New South Wales Government Debentures	5	26,100	0	0	1,305
New South Wales Government Debentures, redeemable 1872–1898	5	9,700	0	0	485
London and Greenwich Railway Debentures	4	50,000	0	0	2,000
3 per Cent. Consols	3	2,745	9	5	82
		£139,845	9	5	6,950

15. We reported to Your Majesty that the Executive Committee last year represented to us that :—

"The great increase in the cost of Fuel, Gas, Clothing and Provisions "which has taken place during the last few years; the higher rate of "wages paid to Servants, and for labour in every branch of trade, and the "enhanced prices of material, combine to render the income, which was "only barely sufficient eighteen years ago, inadequate to the requirements "of the present time. In other Charitable Institutions, these circumstances

"are made the ground of special appeals for further support from the "benevolent, but in the case of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for "Girls, this course is not considered available."

16. The facts embodied in the foregoing extract have been so generally felt and recognised, that in some Schools the increased charges to the Parents have been from fifteen to twenty-five per cent. In the case of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum, there has been the further charge for Rates and Taxes from which it was absolved for some years, but in consequence of a legal decision it has of late been liable, and the amount has been nearly £400 per annum.

17. There have been other causes to tax the financial resources, and which cannot be included in the cost of ordinary Annual Repairs, but which have resulted from the sixteen years' occupation of the premises.

The Engine has been thoroughly repaired; new Steam-Boilers have been placed in the Kitchen and Laundry. The Furnace of the Heating Apparatus has been renewed. Many of the Pipes connected with the Baths, Water-closets, and Wash-basins, having been completely worn out, have been renewed. The Play Sheds have been repaved, and new approaches made to the Closets connected with them. Portions of the Farm buildings and Pigsties have been repaired. The long continuance of Scald-head, now happily at an end, which rendered necessary extra Diet, the employment of extra Nurses, and a great destruction of Clothing and Bedding; and the Epidemic of last year, reported in Paragraph 18, which entailed considerable Expense in the examination of Drains, &c., also considerably augmented the expenditure.

We have recognised the claim of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum to the payment from the General Fund for the cost of Maintenance and Education of Girls over the number of 300, for which the Asylum was contemplated, and under the circumstances described in Paragraphs 15, 16, and 17, we have approved of the sum of £2887 13*s.* 7*d.*, which the Asylum had expended in excess to 30th June, 1875, being paid out of the General Fund.

Epidemic.

18. In July of last year, after the return of the Children from their holidays, a great number suffered from Catarrhal Fever, and there were a few cases of Erysipelas (see Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Medical Officers Letter in Appendix L). No defect could be discovered in the drains, nor any sufficient cause for the sickness, from which the Children had recovered by the middle of August. There are closets attached to the play-sheds, and the Medical Officer, Mr. C. St. Aubyn Hawken, at the Meeting of the Executive Committee on the 12th August, thinking it would be an additional precaution, advised that alterations should be made so as to close the entrances in the play-sheds, and make approaches to the closets by covered ways. This alteration was at once ordered.

19. The Executive Committee reported to us that, to their regret, another epidemic, Peritonitis, broke out at the end of August, which unhappily proved fatal in four cases out of the fifty-two which occurred—one on the 31st August, another on the 1st September, and two others on the 5th September. The Girl who died on the 31st August had been suffering from Mesenteric Abscess, but her death was accelerated by the epidemic. On the 4th September,

an eminent Physician, Dr. Anstie, was called in, and he paid four visits to the schools, on one occasion taking with him a medical friend; every possible step that could be devised was taken to endeavour to trace the cause of the illness. Drains, Closets, Lavatories, were all rigidly examined, Water-tanks were thoroughly cleansed, and new filtering material supplied.

The difficulty consisted in the circumstance that the school was not affected generally, the sufferers being only in the junior section of the children occupying the Western side of the Building.

On the 7th September it was discovered that the day lavatory of the junior section was not connected with the tank in the tower, as every other part of the building was, (including the closets attached to this lavatory,) but was supplied from a cistern in the laundry which is filled from the rain-water tank in the kitchen-yard, and which was only intended for washing purposes. During the long drought of last summer, the water in that tank had been much reduced, and the residue had become impure. It was ascertained that the children, when in the lavatory, had been in the habit of drinking that water, and had spoken of it as being disagreeable. The connection with that cistern was instantly severed. From that time the epidemic ceased, as predicted by Dr. Anstie that it would, the moment he was informed of the discovery which had been made.

20. On the 6th of September Dr. Anstie scratched his finger at the post-mortem examination of one of the little girls: he was soon after taken ill, and died on the 12th. This sad occurrence has caused much regret both to us and the Executive Committee, and we deeply lament the loss sustained by the public of the services of a medical man of such high scientific attainments.

21. Exaggerated reports of the epidemic appeared in the public Papers, and the Wandsworth Local Board of Health directed their Surveyors and Medical Officers to inspect the premises and to report thereon. The Reports of these Local Officers are given in the Appendix (G), together with the observations of the Executive Committee, Appendix H.

22. The Executive Committee, notwithstanding that the epidemic had ceased, and that they had no doubt but the true cause had been found, deemed it advisable—subject to the approval of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, the President of the Commission—to appoint men eminent for their knowledge and experience of sanitary matters to make an investigation into the condition of the school, and the mode of distributing the sewage. His Royal Highness not only approved of the proposed step, but authorised the use of his name with the President of the Local Government Board, who complied with his Royal Highness' request, and appointed the Chief Inspector of that Department, Robert Rawlinson, Esq., C.B., to visit Wandsworth. The Gentlemen deputed by the Executive Committee to make the investigation were Dr. Alfred Carpenter, of Croydon, and Lewis Angell, Esq., C.E., the President of the Association of Municipal and Sanitary Engineers.

The Reports furnished by Mr. Rawlinson, Dr. Carpenter, and Mr. Angell, with a letter from Mr. C. St. Aubyn Hawken the Medical Officer of the Institution, and a letter to Dr. Carpenter, are given in the Appendix (Appendices I, J, K, L, and M).

23. After due consideration of those several Reports, the Executive

Committee had the satisfaction of knowing that the sanitary defects pointed out by the Inspectors in so large a building were few, and they either have been or are in course of being corrected.

24. There can therefore be no reasonable doubt as to the cause of the epidemic of last autumn, and it cannot be attributed to the sewage irrigation. If the illness had resulted from the sewage irrigation, it would have continued, unless the system had been altered. Without any such alteration the recent Monthly Reports of the Medical Officer have been as follow :—

January 1875. Health of School very satisfactory, no serious cases of illness since last report.

February 1875. No serious illness has happened since my last Report. A great many of the Children are suffering from Chilblains, and some of a rather serious nature. Taking into consideration the extreme changes of temperature of the past month, I consider the health of the Children exceptionally good.

March 1875. The illnesses during the month have been few in number and slight in character.

April 1875. No serious illness since last Report.

May 1875. There have been twenty-four cases of slight summer Diarrhœa among the Junior Children.

June 1875. The Children of this School are in a better state of health than I have seen them during the eleven months that I have been visiting the Asylum.

July 1875. The health of the School is thoroughly satisfactory. There are only thirteen cases under treatment, eight of these being for chronic enlarged glands. Most of the others brought to the Infirmary for advice, have been for colds and slightly relaxed throats, the result of the unseasonable weather. Lucy Tomlin, the little girl who has so long suffered from a diseased Hip-joint, is the only occupant of the Infirmary under treatment.

25. It is evidently the opinion of the competent judges, whose Reports are given in the Appendix, that the land is well adapted to receive Sewage. The principal defect dwelt upon in the Reports of the Inspectors, was the mode of distribution; and on this subject the Executive Committee have given directions with the view of disposing of the daily sewage over a larger space than at present, and which will, in their opinion, remove ground for objection.

Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys.

Boys' School.

26. The average number of Boys during the year 1874 was 316, and the general state of health has been satisfactory. In the autumn there were many cases of Contagious Ophthalmia, but the prompt measures of the Medical Officer soon eradicated the disease, and there has been no return of it since.

27. The health of the Superintendent and Head Master, Mr. Hullah, and that of his wife have failed. In the latter part of May, Mr. Hullah became seriously ill from severe and continued hæmorrhage, and, although better, he has not been able to resume his duties. Mrs. Hullah was attacked with Paralysis in March last, and she is completely incapacitated.

28. Mr. and Mrs. Hullah have been at the head of the Boys' School for a period of eleven years and a half; their management has been most efficient and satisfactory, but, under the unfortunate circumstances just mentioned, the Executive Committee felt that they had no alternative but to request them to resign. They have expressed their hope that we would exercise the power vested in us by the 19th Clause of the 30 and 31 Vict. cap. 98 (Patriotic Fund Act, 1867), and submit for the gracious consideration of Your Majesty, that a retiring allowance be given to Mr. and Mrs. Hullah. This recommendation we have approved of, and have made the necessary representation to Your Majesty's Secretary of State for War, with the view of its being submitted for Your Majesty's gracious consideration. We propose that such allowance should be for their joint lives, and that upon the death of either, the question of the annual sum to be paid to the survivor should then be considered.

29. The securities of the Fund accumulating for the endowment of the Boys' School consisted, on the 31st December, 1874, of

	£	s.	d.
East India 4 per Cent. Debentures . . .	32,000	0	0
New 3 per Cent. Annuities	23,812	0	8
Total . . .	£55,812	0	8

"Captain" Relief Fund.

30. During the year 1874, there were no deaths among the Widows, and only 1 Child died; 7 Widows remarried; there were originally 114 Widows. "Captain" Relief Fund.

Widows.

On the 31st December, 1874,
71 were still receiving Widows' allowances.
35 were in the receipt of half allowances as Remarried Women.
2 had their allowances suspended.
6 had died.

114

Children.

The number of Children granted relief was 184.

On the 31st December, 1874, there were
122 in the receipt of Weekly Allowances.
48 in Boarding Institutions.
6 had ceased to receive allowances on account of age.
8 had died.

184

31. The following is a statement of the Securities belonging to the "Captain" Relief Fund, on the 31st December, 1874:—

	£	s.	d.
Canada 5 per Cent. Consolidated Stock	11,915	0	0
Madras 5 per Cent. Railway Stock	11,000	0	0
New South Wales 5 per Cent. Bonds, Redeemable 1888–1900	13,100	0	0
Total . . .	£36,015	0	0

32. A statement of the Receipts and Expenditure, will be found in the Appendix (Appendix N).

RODRIGUEZ FUND.

Rodriguez Fund.

33. The Rodriguez Fund consisted, on the 31st December, 1874, of £8,838 8*s.* 4*d.* Consols.

The Executive Committee in closing their Report expressed their extreme regret for the loss they have sustained by the premature death of their valued Chairman, Lieutenant-General the Hon. Sir James Lindsay, K.C.M.G., who presided at their Meetings with great ability for the period of seven years. Sir James Lindsay having been a Member of the Executive Committee from its commencement, and having at all times devoted much time and attention to the business of the Commission, the Executive Committee the more deeply feel his loss.

The Executive Committee unanimously selected the Right Hon. Lord Hampton, G.C.B., as their Chairman, and earnestly requested him to undertake the office, with which request his Lordship was induced to comply.

We regret to have to announce to Your Majesty that besides Sir James Lindsay, two other Royal Commissioners have died since our report of last year, viz., Lord St. Leonards and Lord Fermoy.

GEORGE, *President.*
SOMERSET.
WELLINGTON.
RIPON.
LAUDERDALE.
CHICHESTER.
NELSON.
GREY.
PETRE.
ROKEBY.
WAVENEY, COLONEL.
HAMPTON.
WINMARLEIGH.
B. DISRAELI.
J. PEEL.
EDWARD LUGARD.
J. G. HUBBARD.
D. H. STONE. (*Lord Mayor*).
RICHARD DACRES.
ANTHONY B. STRANSHAM.
W. A. B. HAMILTON.
HENRY EYRE.

WM. H. MUGFORD, *Secretary.*

20*th July*, 1875.

APPENDIX A.

LIST OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH CHILDREN ARE BOARDED.
31st DECEMBER, 1874.

Rate per Head per Annum. £	s.	SCHOOLS.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
19	0	Asylum at Alresford	..	1	1
15	10	Bethesda Female Orphan Asylum, Dublin	..	1	1
19	0	St. Vincent de Paul Orphanage, Dublin	46	..	46
18	0	St. Mary's Orphanage, North Hyde, Hounslow	35	..	35
17	0	Convent Orphanage at Norwood	..	53	53
17	0	St. Clare's Orphanage, Harold's Cross, Dublin	..	59	59
		Miscellaneous	..	8	8
		Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys, Wandsworth Common	300	..	300
			381	122	503
		Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Girls, Wandsworth Common	..	321	321
		Total	381	443	824*

* Of these 708 are Special Cases.

APPENDIX B.

REV. A. R. GRANT'S INSPECTION, 1875.

ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC ASYLUM FOR GIRLS.

Examined May 13th and 14th, 1875.

Senior School.

	CLASSES. 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total.
Numbers examined	18	18	22	21	18	8	105
Reading	1·00	1·00	0·98	0·95	1·00	0·5	0·98
Writing	0·97	0·95	0·91	0·95	0·61	..	0·88
Arithmetic	0·82	0·85	0·97	0·71	0·96	1·00	0·86

Junior School.

	CLASSES. 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total.
Numbers examined	23	20	21	16	19	9	108
Reading	0·95	0·90	0·83	0·62	0·84	0·61	0·83
Writing	0·99	0·74	0·77	0·93	0·88	..	0·86
Arithmetic	0·77	0·98	1·00	0·94	0·98	0·70	0·92

Senior School.

The individual Examination gives good results on the whole. The Classes are even and well taught. The general result in writing could be much better, but for the comparative failure of the 5th Class, which is probably in part accidental. I have not admitted the figures of the 6th Class into the general results, because it consists of a few Girls admitted late, in a state of great ignorance, and beyond the possibility of raising to a satisfactory standard of attainment. Their examination, therefore, is in no sort a test of the efficiency of the School.

The Girls were examined in Class in the subjects of Geography, Grammar, and Religious Knowledge. Their attainments in all these were satisfactory.

The discipline is good, and the School altogether in a satisfactory condition. The Needlework quite maintains its high character.

Junior School.

The figures representing the results of the individual examination show at once that the strong point of the School is Arithmetic, and also that Reading is not good in proportion. The figures in the Lower Classes denote that the deficiency is chiefly in them. I consider that this results from a weak point in the teaching, which I observed in the course of the Examination.

When the Child who reads comes to a word which she does not know, the Teacher calls upon the Class to say what it is, and the Child consequently looks to the Class to tell her, and takes no pains to make out the word for herself. The Reading Books also, in this School, are old and imperfect, and a new set is required.

In the other subjects of examination, Geography, Grammar, and Religious Knowledge, the Children answered well and showed great interest.

The Pupil-teachers require, I think, more instruction in the art of teaching and more supervision in their work. The School appears to me to be too much left to them.

The Needlework continues to be very good.

Industrial School.

I gave these Girls such Examination as there was time for in the interval of work. They seem to keep up their Reading and Writing well, but their Arithmetic is indifferent.

ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC ASYLUM FOR BOYS.

Examined May 11th and 12th, 1875.

Classes .	UPPER.					LOWER.				
	1	2	3	4	Total.	1	2	3	4	Total.
Numbers examined	31	39	38	38	146	27	22	27	27	103
Reading . . .	1·00	1·00	0·99	0·99	0·99	1·00	1·00	1·00	1·00	1·00
Writing . . .	0·94	0·97	0·93	0·94	0·94	0·97	0·96	0·95	0·78	0·91
Arithmetic . . .	0·96	0·95	0·71	0·90	0·88	0·92	0·92	0·65	0·83	0·83

The annexed Table gives the results of the Examination in the three subjects in which I examine individually. The School is now in a settled state of efficiency. The Classes bear evidence to the soundness of the Teachers' work, by the remarkable evenness of attainment in each. The Reading, as the figures show, has reached a very unusual standard. In the 1st Class, the examination was in the account of the wreck of the *Schiller* in the *Times* of the same morning, and no mistake was made, except in the German names, which, of course, I did not count. The other Classes were examined in their Reading-books. Besides the subjects tabulated, the Boys were examined in History, Geography, Grammar, and Religious Knowledge; in the latter mainly by the Rev. John Kyle. In all these subjects the results were good—least so

in Grammar, which certainly is not up to the standard of the rest; in some points the Boys showed a great deal of information, and in the whole examination an intelligence and interest in their work, which reflect great credit on the Teachers. The discipline of the Institution seems to me highly satisfactory.

A. R. GRANT.

21*st May*, 1875.

REPORT ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHILDREN OF THE PATRIOTIC FUND AT NORTH HYDE AND NORWOOD ORPHANAGES, FOR THE HALF-YEAR, 1874.

NORTH HYDE.

Visited July and August.

Premises.—Thoroughly good; almost luxurious. School-rooms equal to those of superior Schools. Dormitories the same, Bath-room excellent.

Playground.—Spacious and suitable.

Workshops.—Appropriate and well-lighted.

Discipline.—Thoroughly good. The Boys are in high spirits and yet under due control.

Instruction.—Reading very fair.

Dictation and Paper Writing.—Good. Errors very few.

Arithmetic.—Quite satisfactory, evidently taught thoroughly.

Workshops.—Well attended. The specimens of work creditable.

General Results.—As good as on former occasions. This is a thoroughly efficient School, giving evidence of unremitting care in the Teachers, and a judicious admixture of play and work. The staff of Teachers is very devoted.

NORWOOD.

Premises.—As before, excellent.

Fixtures.—All that can be desired.

Ventilation, &c.—Most satisfactory.

Discipline.—As on former visits, appears to be judicious; both firm and kind.

Needlework.—This is always one of the strong points of the School; it is both ornamental and useful.

Instruction.—

(Many of the elder Children have left.)

Reading.—Very satisfactory according to the age of the Children.

Writing.—Very good. The Dictation is generally correctly given.

Arithmetic.—Good as usual. No copying was observed, and most did their working well.

General Results.—As good as could be desired or expected, and equal to those seen on former visits.

J. R. MORELL.

14*th August*, 1874.

ROYAL COMMISSION OF

Dr. ACCOUNT of RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS between

RECEIPTS.			LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT.	AMOUNT.
				£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Balance Cr. on last Account				.. ..	2,982 16 3
To Amount of Interest received on—					
Per cent.		£ s. d.			
£8,800 at 4	Great Indian Peninsular Railway Company's Bonds	173 16 0	31		
72,140 „ 5	East India Railway Stock Certificates	2,003 11 6	„		
87,000 „ 4	East India Government 4 per Cent. Debenture Loan	1,718 5 0	„		
6,000 „ 4	East India 4 per Cent. Stock Certificates	118 10 0	„		
80,000 „ 4¼	Great Western Railway Debentures	1,678 15 0	„		
„ „ ¼	„ „ „ 2 years	400 0 0	„		
40,000 „ 4	North-Eastern Railway Debentures	790 0 0	„		
20,000 „ 4	„ „ „	395 0 0	„		
„ „ 4	„ „ „ Stock	110 7 8	„		
44,600 „ 4	Anglo-Turkish Government Guaranteed Bonds	880 17 0	„		
15,000 „ 4¼	Great Eastern Railway Debentures	314 15 3	„		
17,600 „ 5	Canada Government Debentures	434 10 0	„		
30,000 „ 4	East India 4 per Cent. Railway Debentures	592 10 0	„		
15,000 „ 4½	London and Brighton 4½ per Cent. Debenture Stock—				
	for July 1873 . 332 11 7				
	„ Jan. 7th, 1874 333 5 8				
		665 17 3	„		
				10,276 14 8	
To Amount received on Annuities, *viz.*—					
ANNUITY.	TERMINABLE.	£ s. d.			
£3,405 0 0 ..	5th Jan., 1876 .. 20 years	1,681 4 5	31		
6,097 0 0 ..	5th Apr., 1876 .. 20 „	3,010 7 11	„		
16,900 8 4 ..	5th Apr., 1885 .. 30 „	8,344 11 8	„		
				13,036 4 0	
					23,312 18 8
Rent of Silesia House, Barnet			305	.. ..	73 19 6
Commission on exchange of £80,000, Great Western Railway Debentures for Stock			31		395 0 0
	Balance Dr. as per Contra				3,529 2 1
				£	30,293 16 6

Dr. BOYS' SCHOOL ACCOUNT.

RECEIPTS.		LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT.
			£ s. d.
To Balance from last Account			38 3 9
	£ s. d.		
„ Interest on East India 4 per Cent. Debentures, £32,000	632 0 0		
„ Dividend on New 3 per Cent. Annuities, £22,722 3*s.* 5*d.*	336 11 5		968 11 5
		£	1,006 15 2

RODRIGUEZ FUND ACCOUNT.

			£ s. d.
To Balance from last Account			387 19 7
	£ s. d.		
„ Dividend on £8,838 8*s.* 4*d.* Consols	130 18 4		130 18 4
		£	518 17 11

THE PATRIOTIC FUND.

the 1st of *January* and the 30th of *June*, 1874. *Cr.*

PAYMENTS.	£ s. d.	LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.
By Amount of Allowances to Widows and Orphans—Navy.	4,609 5 10	44		
" " " " " Army.	12,860 0 11	"	17,469 6 9	
" " paid as percentage to Staff-Officers and others		80	448 18 3	
" Allowances to Widows and Orphans of Officers		96	4,005 9 7	
" " " " " Special Cases		141	2,213 12 2	
" " " " " Other Wars		160	394 6 8	
On Account of Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys (Wandsworth)		307	4,062 8 1	
" " Boys' School (Barnet)		305	50 0 0	
" " Admiral Fishbourne, Retiring Allowance		268	150 0 0	
" " Legal Expenses		288	230 0 0	
" " New Boys' School		200	21 16 9	
For Expenses of Office, *viz.*—	£ s. d.			
Salaries—Office	1,036 2 0	271		
Inspectors of Schools {Salaries £41 10 9 / Expenses £0 7 6}	41 18 3	265		
Stationery and Printing	95 8 9	277		
Postage	31 15 8	283		
Travelling Expenses	6 8 2	286		
Miscellaneous	36 5 5	290	1,247 18 3	
				30,293 16 6
By Balance.—At Bank of England (30th June, 1874).	11,305 12 9			
In the hands of Local Authorities, for the payment of Allowances, to be yet accounted for	343 12 10			
Cash in Office	38 19 5	314		
	£11,688 5 0			
Balance due to War Office	15,217 7 1			
Balance Dr.	£3,529 2 1			
			£	30,293 16 6

Boys' School Account. *Cr.*

PAYMENTS.	LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.
By Purchase of £1,089 17*s.* 3*d.* New 3 per Cent. Annuities		1,006 15 2
	£	1,006 15 2

Rodriguez Fund Account.

		£ s. d.
By Balance at Bank of England		518 17 11
	£	518 17 11

ROYAL COMMISSION OF

Dr. ACCOUNT of RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS between

RECEIPTS.			LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT.	AMOUNT.
				£ s. d.	£ s. d.
To Amount of Interest received on—					
Per cent.		£ s. d.			
£8,800 at 4	Great Indian Peninsular Railway Company's Bonds	174 10 8	31		
72,140 „ 5	East India Railway Stock Certificates	1,940 9 9	„		
87,000 „ 4	East India Government 4 per Cent. Debenture Loan	1,725 10 0	„		
6,000 „ 4	East India 4 per Cent. Stock Certificates	119 0 0	„		
80,000 „ 4	Great Western Railway Debenture Stock	1,171 4 7	„		
40,000 „ 4	North-Eastern Railway Debentures	792 8 1	„		
20,000 „ 4	North Eastern Railway Debenture Stock	395 16 8	„		
44,600 „ 4	Anglo-Turkish Government Guaranteed Bonds	884 11 4	„		
15,000 „ 4¼	Great Eastern Railway Debentures	316 1 10	„		
17,600 „ 5	Canada Government Debentures	436 6 8	„		
30,000 „ 4	East India 4 per Cent. Railway Debentures	595 0 0	„		
15,000 „ 4½	London and Brighton 4½ per Cent. Debenture Stock	333 19 8	„		
				8,884 19 3	
To Amount received on Annuities, *viz.*—					
ANNUITY.	TERMINABLE.	£ s. d.			
£3,405 0 0 ..	5th Jan., 1876	20 years . 1,688 6 3	31		
6,097 0 0 ..	5th April, 1876	20 „ . 3,023 1 11	„		
16,900 8 4 ..	5th April, 1885	30 „ . 8,379 15 10	„		
				13,091 4 0	
					21,976 3 3
To Amount of Income Tax returned by Commissioners of Inland Revenue			31	.. ..	624 11 1
„ Turkish Bonds paid off			„	.. ..	400 0 0
„ Proceeds of Sale of £19,600 0*s.* 0*d.* Turkish Bonds			..	.. ..	20,016 10 0
„ Rent of Silesia House, Barnet			..	.. ..	18 15 0
				£	43,035 19 4

Dr.- BOYS' SCHOOL ACCOUNT.

RECEIPTS.		LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT.
			£ s. d.
	£ s. d.		
Interest on East India 4 per Cent. Debentures, £32,000.	634 13 4		
Dividend on New 3 per Cent. Annuities, £23,812 0*s.* 8*d.*	354 4 1		
Amount of Income Tax returned by Commissioners of Inland Revenue	26 15 1		
			1,015 12 6
		£	1,015 12 6

RODRIGUEZ FUND ACCOUNT.

			£ s. d.
To Balance from last Account			518 17 11
	£ s. d.		
„ Dividend on £8,838 8*s.* 4*d.* Consols	131 8 10		
„ Amount of Income Tax returned by Commissioners of Inland Revenue	3 6 3		
			134 15 1
		£	653 13 0

THE PATRIOTIC FUND.

he 1st of *July* and the 31st of *December*, 1874. *Cr.*

PAYMENTS.	£ s. d.	LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.
Balance Dr. on last Account		..	.. ..	3,529 2 1
By Amount of Allowances to Widows and Orphans—Navy	4,375 8 10	45		
Army	12,345 8 6	„		
			16,720 17 4	
„ „ paid as percentage to Staff-Officers and others		80	446 12 3	
„ Allowances to Widows and Orphans of Officers		99	3,567 7 3	
„ „ „ „ „ Special Cases		144	2,254 18 11	
„ „ „ „ „ Other Wars		160	466 10 4	
On Account of Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys (Wandsworth)			3,666 4 4	
„ „ Boys' School (Barnet)			50 0 0	
„ „ Admiral Fishbourne, Retiring Allowance		268	150 0 0	
For Expenses of Office, *viz.*—	£ s. d.			
Salaries—Office	1038 2 0	271		
Inspectors of Schools {Salaries £41 10 8 / Expenses 12 0}	42 2 8	265		
Stationery and Printing	118 3 9	277		
Postage	22 19 1	283		
Travelling Expenses	9 9 3	286		
Miscellaneous	211 7 11	290		
			1,442 4 8	
				28,764 15 1
	£ s. d.			
By Balance.—At Bank of England (31st December, 1874)	40,730 13 11			
In the hands of Local Authorities, for the payment of Allowances, to be yet accounted for	139 9 11			
Cash in Office	24 1 6			
	£40,894 5 4			
Balance due to War Office	30,152 3 2			
Balance Cr.	£10,742 2 2			
Balance Cr.		..	.. ..	10,742 2 2
			£	43,035 19 4

Boys' School Account. *Cr.*

PAYMENTS.	LEDGER FOLIO.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.
By Balance at Bank of England		1,015 12 6
	£	1,015 12 6

Rodriguez Fund Account.

By Balance at Bank of England		653 13 0
	£	653 13 0

ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC

Dr. STATEMENT of RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE

RECEIPTS.	LEDGER FOLIO.	——	AMOUNT.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
To Balance on 31st December, 1873:—			
With Lady Superintendent	..	.. ..	74 16 1
Interest on—			
Per cent.			
£10,000 at 6 | South Australian (Adelaide and Gawler Town) Railway Debentures	163	593 15 0	
36,300 „ 6 | Canadian Government „ . .	„	2,155 6 3	
26,100 „ 5 | New South Wales Government „ . .	„	1,291 8 1	
9,700 „ 5 | „ „ „ „ 1872–1898	„	479 18 11	
50,000 „ 4 | London and Greenwich Railway „ . .	„	1,977 1 8	
5,000 „ 6 | New Brunswick Government Guaranteed Bonds .	„	296 17 6	
Dividend on £2,745 9*s.* 5*d.* 3 per Cent. Consols	„	81 10 8	
			6,875 18 1
Transferred from "Captain" Fund	163	.. ..	38 10 10
To Amount of Income Tax returned by Commissioners of Inland Revenue	„	.. ..	89 4 0
Transferred from General Account, viz.—			
For Vegetables (from Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys) .	163	20 2 5	
„ Maintenance of Orphans in excess of 300	158 166	407 16 9	
„ Outfits	149	105 0 0	
„ Travelling expenses	63	4 8 3	
„ Washing (Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Boys) . . .	163	83 6 6	
„ Bread Ditto	130 163	772 18 0	
„ Milk Ditto	163	284 1 3	
			1,677 13 2
Proceeds of Sales on account of—			
Clothing (Rags, &c.)	148 149	14 12 1	
Farm Produce	56	129 4 0	
Provisions	129	7 2 2	
Carriage of Fruit	125	6 0	
Miscellaneous	158	67 19 0	
			219 3 3
Balance due to H. M. Paymaster-General	..	.. ..	4,285 1 9
Total	..	.. .. £	13,260 7 2

ASYLUM FOR GIRLS.

between 1st *January* and 31st *December*, 1874. *Cr.*

EXPENDITURE.	Ledger Folio.	£ s. d.	AMOUNT. £ s. d.
Balance repaid H. M. Paymaster-General from last year	163	.. ..	66 14 9
By Payments on account, viz.:—			
Rent of Railway Slopes	27	.. ..	1 0 0
Lodges	27	.. ..	1 0 0
Building Repairs	120	.. ..	782 14 6
Engine Repairs	32	.. ..	147 12 2
Heating Apparatus	126	.. ..	350 11 1
ASYLUM.			
Furniture, including Repairs	124	382 14 0	
Stationery, Books, and School Materials	132	84 1 4	
Provisions and Water	130	4,956 1 5	
Clothing	149	1,608 0 4	
Fuel and Lighting	160	1,240 7 1	
Medicines, Medical Comforts, and Necessaries	161	72 9 8	
Salaries and Wages	114	1,739 15 8	
Insurance and Taxes	89	479 18 0	
Washing	164	62 18 9	
Postage	106	23 1 7½	
Travelling	63, 170	31 16 10	
Carriage	125	32 17 10	
Gratuities, Rewards, and Prizes	109	10 15 1	
Miscellaneous	158, 168	276 8 3½	
			11,001 5 11
FARM AND GARDEN.			
Implements, Garden Tools, and Repairs	46	100 4 3	
Cattle	56	50 10 0	
Food for Cattle	108	637 10 8	
Soil, Seed, and Manure	45	7 6 7	
Harness	37	11 2 2	
			806 13 8
By Balance with Lady Superintendent	..	.. ..	102 15 1
Total	..	.. .. £	13,260 7 2

APPENDIX F.

London, 1st July, 1875.

SIR,

IN compliance with your request, the usual annual valuation of the Liabilities and Assets of the Patriotic Fund, as they stood on the 31st of December, 1874, has been prepared.

Of the three groups into which it has been customary to class the liabilities, the Pensions to Widows naturally occupy the front rank, as they entail the largest obligation on the Fund; the allowances granted in respect of the Children are next in importance; and, lastly, the charge is completed with the account of the yearly outlay for miscellaneous purposes and management.

The following list of details will afford a complete view of the mode in which the present outlay for Pensions to Widows has arisen:

The number of Widows of Non-Commissioned and Petty Officers, Private Soldiers, and Seamen, placed on the books from the commencement, has been			3,773
Of these there have died		757	
And have been removed from the list	378		
But of these there have been readmitted	121		
Leaving a balance of		257	
The number whose allowances have ceased is therefore			1,014
And the number of annuitants remaining on the list is			2,759
The number of Widows who have remarried, and have consequently been placed on Half Pension is		2,117	
But of these there have died while remarried		300	
Leaving a balance of		1,817	
From among the remarried section, however, there have been replaced on Full Pension, as they were again deprived of their husbands	411		
Which number has afterwards been reduced by Widows who married for the third or fourth time	129		
The number finally replaced on Full Pension being		282	
There are therefore now on Half Pension			1,535
And the remainder of the whole number now on the list are the Widows drawing the Full Pension.			1,224
The yearly charge for the 1,224 Widows, at £14 per annum each, is			£17,136
And for 1,535 remarried women, at £7 per annum each			10,745
The total yearly charge for 2,759 pensioners being			£27,881

The additional number of Widows placed on the List for the first time in the year 1874, was only six. This is an accession of such comparative unimportance as to be without effect on the average age of the whole body. For the purposes of the present valuation it may be safely assumed, when the lapse of time is taken into account, that the mean age of the Widows is now 54 years, and of the remarried Women 50 years.

Further, the pensioners now in a state of Widowhood may be estimated to again contract matrimony to the extent of 2 per cent.

With regard to Officers' Widows, there have been placed on the Pension List altogether			207
Of these there have died (five of whom had remarried)		42	
And there are no longer in receipt of the Allowance		10	
There have remarried	38		
Of whom, as above stated, there have died	5		
So there remain of remarried ladies	33		
But the Half Pension is drawn by only	21		
The remainder being no longer on the List		12	

So that the whole number withdrawn is	64
And therefore there are in receipt of Allowances	143
Of whom, as above stated, there are on Half Pension	21
The balance drawing the full amount, namely	122

The average age of those Ladies who are in receipt of the Full Pension may now be taken at 54, while those who, being remarried, draw only Half Pensions, may be set down at 47 years, after allowance is made for the year which has passed since the date of the last valuation.

	£	*s.*	*d.*
The annual charge for the Full Pensions of £38 10*s.* each to 122 Officers' Widows is	4,697	0	0
And for 21 Half Pensions to remarried Ladies	404	5	0
The total yearly charge on account of 143 Officers' Widows being	£5,101	5	0
Adding to this the yearly charge already set forth for 2,759 Widows and remarried, viz.	27,881	0	0
The total annual charge on account of 2,902 Widows will be found to amount to	£32,982	5	0

The expense of the provision for the Orphan Children—the second head under which a portion of the liabilities of the Fund is to be ranked—grows out of the charge occasioned by the following details:

The Orphans placed on the books up to 31st December, 1874, were altogether		5,099
Of these there have died	659	
And Allowances have been discontinued to	4,183	
There have ceased to be chargeable therefore		4,842
So there remain on the books		257
Out of this number there are in Boarding Institutions	61	
And in the Victoria Asylum	55	
Making a total of	—	116
The remainder are the number of Children who are chargeable at £5 16*s.* each, viz.		141
Of Special Cases there are		708
But of whom those in the Victoria Asylum are not chargeable, namely		266
Leaving chargeable at the rate of £17 10*s.*		442
There are also chargeable at £17 10*s.* those Children who, as already stated, are in Boarding Institutions, namely		61
Making a total number pensioned at this rate of		503

	£	*s.*	*d.*
The 141 Children at £5 16*s.* create a yearly charge of	817	16	0
And 503 at £17 10*s.* a yearly charge of	8,802	10	0
The annual outlay for the 644 Children being	£9,620	6	0

For Officers' Children

	£	*s.*	*d.*
There is an average charge of £19 each for 99 Children amounting to	1,881	0	0
Also a similar charge for 43 "Orphans of other Wars"	817	0	0
And further, an allowance is made of £25 each in respect of 206 Special Cases	5,150	0	0
The annual charge for 348 Officers' Children being	£7,848	0	0
Adding the yearly charge for 644 other Children	9,620	6	0
The total annual charge for 992 Children is	£17,468	6	0

In respect of the third and last group of charges, it has been usual to assemble the expenditure on account of outfits, the outgoing for relief in Sickness, and also for other miscellaneous objects, and to include as well under this general head the charge for management. As on previous occasions, the outlay on account of the Pensioners and Orphans now on the Books for Outfits, relief in Sickness, &c., has been placed for the current year at £5,000, and for each of the four succeeding twelvemonths at £2,500.

The charge for Management is at present estimated at £2,560 a year, which amount, it is presumed, will in progress of time likewise be in course of diminution.

A recapitulation can now be made of the total annual expenditure for the several objects which have previously been set forth in fuller detail.

The yearly charge for Widows and Remarried Women's pensions has been taken at	£32,982	5	0
The yearly charge for Children at	17,468	6	0
And the outgoing for sundries and management at . .	7,560	0	0
The total annual charge for all the above purposes being placed at	£ 58,010	11	0

A valuation of these Liabilities has been made as on former occasions on the basis of 4 per cent. interest as the rate at which the Securities in the possession of the Patriotic Fund may be safely expected to improve in the future.

The laws of mortality adopted in previous years have also been adhered to in the present Computations.

The resources available for the discharge of the Liabilities above enumerated consist of £27,412 of Terminable Annuities, and £16,646 of Permanent Annual Income.

Besides other Terminable Dividends, the assets in question comprise £26,402 Government Annuities for terms of years which have been valued on, the basis of 4 per cent. interest, at £159,042. There are also Colonial and Guaranteed Securities valued at £136,080; and there are further Railway Debentures, Railway Debenture Stock, and Guaranteed Railway Stocks, valued at £293,398. The total worth of the assets is therefore placed at a sum of £588,520.

The Securities which returned interest at the rate of 4 per cent. have been valued, as on previous occasions, at par.

In cases where certain other descriptions of Bonds or Stocks returned a higher rate of interest, the Stock Exchange Estimate of their value has been adopted, and the prices quoted in Wetenhall's Stock and Share Lists for the 2nd of January, 1875, have been used for the basis of valuation.

The final results shown in the Balance Sheet will be found to be as follows; namely, that

The Securities possessed by the Fund are worth in ready money	£588,520
And the Liabilities are estimated at	507,433
A Surplus Balance is therefore disclosed which amounts to	£81,087

When the usual deduction of 10 per cent. of the Liabilities of the Fund of £50,743 is made as a reserve for the object of security, a nett surplus of £30,344 is left disposable for general purposes.

The Table which attempts to shadow out the Income and Expenditure of future years will, as usual, be found appended to this Report.

I am, Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

ALEXANDER GLEN FINLAISON.

W. H. Mugford, Esq.,
Secretary to the Royal Commission of the Patriotic Fund.

APPENDIX F—*continued.*

1st January, 1875.

MEMORANDUM of PARTICULARS on which the STATEMENT of the probable future CHARGE and INCOME is founded.

CHARGE.

Temporary Charge for	1,224 Widows, at £14 per annum each	.. .. ..	£17,136	
Abate for Remarriage	commencing with 2 per cent.	.. .. ..	343	
			£16,793	
Temporary Charge for	1,535 Remarried women, at £7 per annum each	£10,745		
Add Moiety of the above Rebate	.. ..	.. 172		
			£10,917	
	2,759 Persons		£27,710	
Temporary Charge for	143 Widows of Officers		5,101	
Temporary Annual Charge for	2,902 Widows and Remarried Women			£32,811
Temporary Charge for	141 Children at £ 5 16 0 per annum each		£ 818	
,, ,,	503 ,, 17 10 0 ,, ,, ...		8,802	
,, ,,	644 Children		£9,620	
,, ,,	99 (348) Officers' Children at £19 per annum each . . .		£1,881	
,, ,,	43 (348) ,, ,, (Orphans of other Wars) at £19 per annum each		817	
,, ,,	206 (348) ,, ,, Special Cases at £25 per annum each .		5,150	
			7,848	
Temporary Annual Charge for	992 Children			17,468
	Widows and Children			£50,279
Temporary Annual Charge for Extras	.. ..		£5,000	
,, ,, ,, for Management	.. ..		2,560	
				7,560
	Total Annual Charge			£57,839

INCOME.

Perpetuities.—Turkish Government Bonds	.. ..	4 per cent.	£ 984
East India Debentures	.. ..	4 ,,	3,480
East India Stock Certificates	.. ..	4 ,,	240
Canada Bonds	.. ..	5 ,,	704
Great Indian Peninsular Railway	.. ..	4 ,,	352
Great Western Railway	.. ..	4 ,,	3,200
North-Eastern ,,	.. ..	4 ,,	1,600
North-Eastern Debenture Stock	.. ..	4 ,,	800
Great Eastern ,, ,,	.. ..	4½ ,,	600
London and Brighton Debenture Stock	.. ..	4½ ,,	600
East India Railway Debentures	.. ..	4 ,,	1,200
,, ,, Stock Certificates	.. ..	5 ,,	2,886
	Perpetual Income		£16,646
Terminable Annuities, expiring at various periods	.. ..	£26,402	
Other Dividends, expiring at various periods	.. ..	1,010	
	Terminable Income		£27,412
	Total Income		£44,058

PATRIOTIC FUND.

Statement of Assets and Liabilities, on the 1st January, 1875.

LIABILITIES.

£17,136	Full Pensions	to 1,224	Widows at £14 per annum each, present value		£194,678
			Abate 2 per cent. for remarriage		3,894
					190,784
10,745	Half Pensions	to 1,535	Widows remarried, at £7 per annum each	£134,597	
			Add moiety of above rebate	1,947	
					136,544
27,881		2,759			327,328
4,697	Full Pensions	122	Officers' Widows	58,957	
			Abate 2 per cent. for remarriage ..	1,179	
				57,778	
404	Half Pensions	21	Officers' Widows Remarried	5,807	
	£5,101 Pensions	143	Officers' Widows		63,585
32,982	..	2,902	Widows and re-married Women		390,913
818	Provision for ..	141	Children at £ 5 16s. 0d. each		2,776
8,802	Ditto ..	503	Ditto £17 10s. 0d. each		36,251
9,620		644	Ditto		39,027
1,881	..	99	Officers' Children at £19 each, £	8,286	
817	..	43	Ditto, ditto 19 each,	4,494	
5,150	..	206	Ditto, ditto 25 each,	26,648	
£7,848	Provision for	348	Officers' Children		39,428
17,468	Provision for ..	992	Children		78,455
			Widows and Children		469,368
2,500	Extra Charges for 5 years ..		.. ..		11,228
2,500	Ditto ditto 1 year ..		.. ..		2,427
5,000	.. .. ..		.. ..		13,655
2,560	Management Charges ..		.. ..		24,410
7,560	Miscellaneous and Management Charges ..		.. ..		38,065
			Liabilities		507,433
			Surplus Balance		81,087
					£588,520

ASSETS.

	£			£	
Annuities certain	3,405	Expiring 5 Jan., 1876	Present value ..	5,008	
,,	6,097	,, 5 Apr., 1876	,, ..	8,878	
,,	16,900	,, 5 Apr., 1885	,, ..	145,156	
,,	26,402	Government Securities	.. ..		£159,042
				£	
Guaranteed Turkish Bonds,		4 per Cent. at par		24,600	
,, East India Debentures,		4 ,, ,,		87,000	
,, East India Stock Certificates,		4 ,, ,,		6,000	
,, Canada Bonds,		5 ,, ,,		18,480	
Colonial and Guaranteed Securities					136,080

Railway Bonds.

Great Indian Peninsular	4 per Cent.	8,800 at par	8,800	
Great Western	4 ,,	80,000 ,,	80,000	
North-Eastern	4 ,,	40,000 ,,	40,000	
Ditto Debenture Stock ..	4 ,,	20,000 ,,	20,000	
Great Eastern Ditto ..	4½ ,,	15,000 (vide note)	15,137	
London and Brighton Debenture Stock	4½ ,,	15,000 at 110	16,500	
East Indian Railway Debentures ..	4 ,,	30,000 at par	30,000	
Ditto do. Stock Certificates	5 ,,	72,140 at 115	82,961	
Railway Bonds				£293,398

Note.—Where no price is quoted in Wetenhall's Stock and Share List, the interest returned on Securities above the rate of four per Cent. has been valued as a terminable Annuity.

£588,520

ALEXANDER GLEN FINLAISON.

APPENDIX F—*continued.*

STATEMENT, from and after 1875 to the Year 1900, of the probable TEMPORARY and PERMANENT CHARGE on the PATRIOTIC FUND; also the TERMINABLE and PERPETUAL INCOME available to meet the said Charge; and further, the Deficiency or Surplus of Income in each Year, as the case may be.

YEAR.	CHARGE.					INCOME.			Deficiency.	Perpetual Income lost by Deficiency.	Surplus.	Perpetual Income restored by Surplus.
	For Widows.	For Children.	Widows and Children.	Chiefly Permanent, as per Memorandum.	Temporary and Permanent.	Terminable.	Perpetual.	Terminable and Perpetual.				
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1875	32,811	17,468	50,279	7,560	57,839	27,412	16,646	44,058	13,781	551	..	..
1876	32,217	13,912	46,129	5,060	51,189	22,661	16,095	38,756	12,433	497	..	..
1877	31,600	10,060	41,660	4,360	46,020	17,910	15,598	33,508	12,512	501	..	..
1878	30,963	8,358	39,321	4,360	43,681	17,910	15,097	33,007	10,674	427	..	..
1879	30,381	6,804	37,185	4,360	41,545	17,910	14,670	32,580	8,965	358	..	..
1880	29,695	5,075	34,770	4,360	39,130	17,621	14,312	31,933	7,197	288	..	..
1881	28,986	3,730	32,716	1,560	34,276	17,621	14,024	31,645	2,631	105	..	..
1882	28,250	2,678	30,928	1,560	32,488	17,621	13,919	31,540	948	38	..	..
1883	27,485	1,754	29,239	1,560	30,799	17,621	13,881	31,502	..	..	703	28
1884	26,759	1,204	27,963	1,560	29,523	17,621	13,909	31,530	..	..	2,007	80
1885	25,931	765	26,696	1,560	28,256	9,171	13,989	23,160	5,096	204	..	..
1886	25,041	445	25,486	1,560	27,046	..	13,785	13,785	13,261	530	..	..
1887	24,099	176	24,275	1,560	25,835	..	13,255	13,255	12,580	503	..	..
1888	23,112	105	23,217	1,560	24,777	..	12,752	12,752	12,025	481	..	..
1889	22,089	70	22,159	1,260	23,419	..	12,271	12,271	11,148	446	..	..
1890	21,020	35	21,055	1,260	22,315	..	11,825	11,825	10,490	420	..	..
1891	19,924	..	19,924	1,260	21,184	..	11,405	11,405	9,779	391	..	..
1892	18,805	..	18,805	1,260	20,065	..	11,014	11,014	9,051	362	..	..
1893	17,671	..	17,671	1,260	18,931	..	10,652	10,652	8,279	331	..	..
1894	16,523	..	16,523	1,260	17,783	..	10,321	10,321	7,462	298	..	..
1895	15,375	..	15,375	900	16,275	..	10,023	10,023	6,252	250	..	..
1896	14,220	..	14,220	900	15,120	..	9,773	9,773	5,347	214	..	..
1897	13,063	..	13,063	900	13,963	..	9,559	9,559	4,404	176	..	..
1898	11,925	..	11,925	900	12,825	..	9,383	9,383	3,442	138	..	..
1899	10,817	..	10,817	900	11,717	..	9,245	9,245	2,472	99	..	..
1900	9,746	..	9,746	900	10,646	..	9,146	9,146	1,500	60	..	..

ALEXANDER GLEN FINLAISON.

APPENDIX G.

REPORT on the Sanitary Conditions of the ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC SCHOOLS, on Wandsworth Common, by the MEDICAL OFFICERS of HEALTH and SURVEYORS of WANDSWORTH and BATTERSEA.

October 6th, 1874.

COPY REPORT OF SURVEYORS.

To the Board of Works for the Wandsworth District.

GENTLEMEN,

IN accordance with your instructions we have on two separate occasions, viz.: September 24th and October 6th, 1874, inspected the Schools, Premises, and Grounds, of the "Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum," as to the Sanitary Arrangements, and the System of Sewage Irrigation now in course of operation at these Schools, and beg to report as follows :—

As a commencement to our investigation, we were conducted to the top or roof of the building of the Girls' School, in which are fixed four large water tanks, that supply the whole of the building with water.

In one of these tanks are three troughs filled with broken shell, charcoal, and shingle, through which the water supplied from the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company's Main, is filtered, and passed from thence into the other cisterns, by means of connecting troughs, each cistern being allotted to various portions of the building.

The overflow pipe from these cisterns, until recently, was connected with the rain water pipe from the roof, this, however, has been discontinued, and the overflow water is now distributed on to a lower roof, and from thence flows away into the sunk tank in the Laundry yard below.

Having inspected the Water Tanks, and the various Closets in the Building which we found to be in good working condition, we inspected the Lavatory used by the Younger Children of the School situated at the south-west end of the Building, and we had pointed out to us, two pipes, one a pipe used for supplying a cistern with rain water, and intended for the use of the Laundry only, which is adjacent to this Lavatory, the other a pipe connected with the Water Tanks in the roof, but by some supposed error on the part of the Workmen at the time this portion of the Building was erected, a connection was made to supply the Children's Lavatory, on to the supply pipe intended solely for the Rain Water Tank, and from this the Children have been in the habit of drinking for a long time; this has however since been altered.

The whole of the rain water from the various Buildings is collected solely for the use of the Laundry by means of a Covered Tank sunk below the level of the Laundry Yard, the size of the Tank being 30 feet long, 10 feet 6 inches wide, and 8 feet 6 inches deep, and from this the water is pumped, as required, into a Cistern fixed in the roof of the laundry; no other pipes except the Rain Water Pipes are connected with the Tank, but an overflow pipe is provided from the Tank into the common surface drain.

The whole of the Sanitary and other arrangements within the Two Buildings are of an exceptionally good character, great care having been displayed in the arrangements of the Lavatories, Water Closets, Baths, &c., and additional improvements are being carried out in connection with the Girls' Water Closets adjacent to the Play Ground.

SEWAGE IRRIGATION.

The Altitude of the Land generally is about 67 feet above Trinity High-water mark, and covers (including Schools) about 52 Acres of Land. The soil is of a Gravelly Loamy Nature, generally suited for Irrigation purposes, somewhat flat but undulating towards both the London and South Western and Brighton Railways.

About Two Thirds of the Land is used partly as Grass Land, and partly as Vegetable Garden Ground, under their System of Irrigation, the remainder of the land being used for the Site of the Schools, and Grass Land, *not Irrigated.*

The System of Drainage from the Schools is by means of a nine inch glazed earthenware pipe drain, emptying into a Cesspool about three feet square, in the face of which is an Iron Strainer, and from thence into large Receivers or Cesspools.

There are Two of these Cesspools for the use of the Girls' School, capable of holding about 20,000 Gallons each, and one for the Boys' capable of holding about 35,000 Gallons, covered with perforated wood flaps, the size of the former being about 14 feet by 18 feet, and 14 feet by 20 feet, respectively, and that of the latter 14 feet by 31 feet.

The distance of the Cesspools from the Girls' School (north-east corner) is about 125 yards, and from the Boys' School (south side) about 300 yards.

After the Sewage has passed into the Cesspools it is pumped over the Land, care being taken never to use it except on that portion of the Land where the wind will prevent any unpleasantness being experienced at the Schools.

We were also informed that the Cesspools never remain over two days without being emptied.

The least objectionable Cesspool used is in connection with the Boys' School; but as the system of "Moules'" Earth-closet is used there, very little solid matter is found therein, the refuse of the Boys' Closets being carted direct on the land, and deposited in a heap as manure.

The whole of the Land under Irrigation is drained by the usual system of Land Drainage, viz: small earthenware pipes laid loose to a proper gradient, being, at its highest point, about 18 inches under the ground. These pipes, with their various tributaries, drain by three pipes into a circular well, near the Boys' School, and from thence by a 12 inch pipe drain along the front of the Boys' School, finally emptying itself into an open watercourse running by the side of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company's line towards Clapham Junction.

Upon a further Inspection of this portion of the line we discovered two other drains situated on the east side of the Girls' School and the Farm Yard, where Sewage matter was being discharged into a continuation of the above-mentioned watercourse, as also a discharge pipe emptying into the watercourse of the London and South Western Railway Company's Line; leading us to infer that an overflow exists from the Tanks, other than as pointed out to us, and as a means of partially emptying the Tanks when not required for the purpose of Irrigation.

We are, Gentlemen,
Your obedient Servants,
J. T. PILDITCH,
Surveyor for the Parish of Battersea.
ANTHY. DOBSON,
Surveyor for the Parish of Wandsworth.

October 6th, 1874.

COPY REPORT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

To the Board of Works for the Wandsworth District.

GENTLEMEN,

IN accordance with your instructions, we have this day made a careful examination of the "Royal Victoria Patriotic Schools," on Wandsworth Common, in reference to their general sanitary condition, and especially to the processes of "Sewage Irrigation," conducted on the grounds of these establishments, and to the cause of the late "Epidemic."

The nature and extent of that examination are shewn in the foregoing report of Messrs. Dobson and Pilditch, the Surveyors of the Parishes of Wandsworth and Battersea respectively, and the whole of the details described in that report we have verified by personal investigation. It will not be necessary therefore to repeat the description of such details, but to observe only that the whole of the structural arrangements of the interiors of the buildings, especially of the School Rooms and the Dormitories, as regards their provision for light, space and ventilation, the lavatories, baths and water closets were found to be excellent in a sanitary point of view, and that they presented no condition

calculated to be prejudicial to health. To this general statement one exception was noted; the drinking-water cisterns were ascertained to have not been cleansed for about two years previous to the outbreak of the late Epidemic; a more frequent renewal of the filtering media, we need scarcely observe, is necessary, otherwise, becoming clogged with organic matter, they furnish a means of producing the very mischief they are intended to prevent. (Samples of the water have been submitted to Dr. Muter for analysis, but the results not yet obtained.)

The condition of the Children was noted, and the nature and amount of the diseases which have prevailed amongst them inquired into, and we found that the health of the Girls had been somewhat impaired for a considerable length of time, especially of those of the "Junior Section" of the school, whose appearance generally was confirmatory of the fact.

The late "Epidemic."

After a mature consideration of all the circumstances presented in connection with the late "Epidemic," at the Girls' School, we are of opinion that the cause of the outbreak is undoubtedly attributable to the use of the foul water of the rain-water tank, which, in some unexplained manner, was laid on to the Lavatory of the Junior Section of the School when the Institution was first built. The water in the tank at the time of the outbreak had probably become very foul in consequence of the tank having become nearly empty, and thus caused an admixture of organic and other sediment; but it must also certainly have become foul from the entrance into the tank of the gases generated in the Cesspool receiving the general drainage of the establishment, by reason of the following arrangements which admitted of such taking place. There were overflow pipes (now disconnected) which conveyed the overflow of the drinking-water cisterns situated at the top of the central tower of the building, and which passed directly down into the rain-water tank; there is an overflow pipe from the rain-water tank conveying its overflow into the cesspool; these overflow pipes are with the exception of the suction pipe of the pump, the only openings in the rain-water tank. By such arrangement it is evident that the gases generated in the cesspool had free access to the rain-water tank, whence they passed up the overflow pipes of the drinking-water cisterns. That such did take place is confirmed by the fact that a strong smell of sewer-gas was observable at the upper mouths of these pipes, and that there is no other means by which sewer gas could be present in such situation. It may be objected that no outbreak of the kind occurred before the present, although the conditions had been previously the same. The explanation lies most probably in the fact, that, although the conditions were of the same nature, they were not of the same intensity. The human body, as is well known, is capable of resisting, more or less, the effects of noxious influences up to a certain point, and, in this instance, that point was passed when, as the result of an unusual drought of the season, a small amount of water became impregnated by a consequently larger volume of sewer gas in the tank thus presented for absorption to such extent as was sufficient to produce in it poisonous effects. In corroboration of such view, we would point out that the nature of the Epidemic was such as was consistent with poisoning by such means; that it was the "Junior Section" of the School that had been supplied with the water from this rain-water tank; that it was this section which had, as has been before stated, suffered from impaired health for a long time; and the same section which suffered from the "Epidemic." Moreover, the "Epidemic" ceased as soon as this foul-water supply was cut off.

Sewage—Irrigation.

Although we have been unable to discover any direct connection as cause and effect, between the recent "Epidemic" and the irrigation of the grounds with sewage, or to trace to the latter, the actual occurrence of disease, yet, looking to the extensive area of the land subjected to the process, the large amount of sewage employed, its almost continuous distribution over the land in proximity to the buildings, and in the absence of any other apparent or probable cause, together with the excellent arrangements within the buildings for the maintenance of health, we are led to the conclusion that the lowered health of

the inmates of the Girls' School can only be accounted for by the presence of the system of Sewage Irrigation pursued, the conditions of which are such as are calculated to produce the slight, yet very observable, deterioration of health described; and we are of opinion, that Sewage Irrigation ought not to be conducted on those premises, especially under the conditions there presented.

We have the honour to remain,
Gentlemen,
Your very obedient Servants,

W. H. KEMPSTER, *Medical Officer of Health for East Battersea.*

JOSEPH OAKMAN, *Medical Officer of Health for West Battersea.*

GEORGE EDWARD NICHOLAS, M.D., *Medical Officer of Health for Wandsworth.*

THE BOARD OF WORKS,
October 6th, 1874.

APPENDIX H.

Royal Commission of the Patriotic Fund.
3, St. Martin's Place, Trafalgar Square,
London, W.C.

SIR, *29th June*, 1875.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 16th of October, and of the 3rd of November, 1874, enclosing, by desire of the Wandsworth Board of Works, copies of the Reports made by the Surveyors and the Medical Officers of the Parishes of Battersea and Wandsworth, on the sanitary conditions of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylums on Wandsworth Common, and the copy of a Report made by Dr. Muter, Public Analyst, on certain samples of earth, &c., which had been submitted to him.

2. I am desired to acquaint you, for the information of the Wandsworth Board of Works, that, in October last, the Executive Committee appointed Lewis Angell, Esq., C.E., President of the Association of Municipal and Sanitary Engineers, &c., and Dr. Alfred Carpenter, of Croydon, to Inspect and Report on the Schools and Grounds. And, at the earnest request of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, President of the Royal Commission of the Patriotic Fund, the President of the Local Government Board appointed the Chief Inspector of that Department, Robert Rawlinson, Esq., C.B., to examine and Report on the Schools and Premises.

3. The Reports of the above Gentlemen, as well as those of the Officers of the Wandsworth Board of Works, have been carefully considered by the Executive Committee, and I am directed to offer the following observations on the Reports of the Officers of the Wandsworth Board of Works:—

REPORT OF THE SURVEYORS.

4. The description given by the Surveyors is generally accurate, but there are one or two points which call for remark. In the latter part of the sixth paragraph, the Overflow of the Rain-water Tank is described as being taken into the common "Surface" drain, which should have been described as the "Sewage" drain of the School. This overflow pipe is effectively trapped, and the trap has been examined several times since, and on each occasion it was found in good order.

5. The ninth paragraph is not a correct description, an error having probably crept into the Surveyor's notes. The drain from the School is a 12-inch drain; and there is a second drain from the Infirmary, and one or two other parts of the establishment, which is a 9-inch pipe. The 12-inch and 9-inch pipes open into the space described as about three feet square, and the

bottom is about three feet from the surface of the ground. This square aperture is a short distance from the Cesspits. The cover is always kept raised, as it is a ventilator to the drains; and even supposing gas were generated in the Cesspits, and which did not pass up through their perforated covers, it would escape into the open air through this ventilator, instead of going up the pipes to the Buildings.

From the small square space above mentioned there are two pipes leading into two receivers, which have strainers in the walls separating them from the Cesspits. The two Cesspits contain about 32,000 gallons, instead of 20,000, and, as just stated, there are numerous holes in their covers.

6. The paragraph in the Surveyors' Report which requires most attention is the last, wherein it is inferred that some misrepresentation was made to them, or concealment practised, on the occasion of their visit. There is no overflow whatever from the Cesspits; and herein is the great protection, because, if at any time there should be any neglect on the part of the Engineer, it must be at once detected by the over-filling of the Tanks, there being no possible outlet for the sewage, except by pumping.

7. The pipe discharging into the Watercourse of the London and South-Western Railway, is entirely unconnected with any Water-closet, and cannot in any way contain sewage. The growth of water-cresses in the course of the discharge, after it leaves the pipe, has been pointed out as certain evidence of the absence of sewage.

8. One of the pipes on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway does not belong to the Patriotic Fund, although it passes through the ground. It proceeds from the Common, south of the estate belonging to this Commission, with which it has no connection. The second pipe on this Railway is an overflow pipe from the Farm Yard, and the discharge might have been slightly contaminated when seen by the Surveyors. Instructions have been given for the more frequent pumping of the Tank, which receives the Rain-water, &c., from the Buildings.

9. It is with great satisfaction that the Committee notice the recorded opinions of the Surveyors, of the exceptionally good character of the Sanitary Arrangements of the Buildings, and of the generally suitable nature of the soil for irrigation purposes—points which will be dwelt upon in a later part of this letter.

Report of the Medical Officers.

10. Until the portion of the Report headed "The late Epidemic," there is little requiring comment. In the third paragraph, however, the Medical Officers observe, that the appearance of the Children was confirmatory of the impression that a low standard of health had for some time prevailed.

11. On the return of the Children from the Holidays, in the early part of July last, an attack of Catarrhal Fever ensued, which largely affected the Girls' School; and it is a singular circumstance that none of the one hundred Girls, who remained in the School during the Holidays, were affected with the fever until after the return of those who had been home. This Catarrhal Fever during July and August, and the fact that so large a portion of the Junior School had been affected, and at the time of the Medical Officers' visit in the early part of October had only just recovered from the Epidemic, is sufficient to account for the Children not looking then so robust as they ordinarily do, and which robust appearance was speedily resumed. Doubtless, in the performance of their parochial duties, and in their private practices, the Medical Officers had large experience of the prevalence of Catarrhal Fever and of Erysipelas in the summer of last year.

The late Epidemic.

12. The opinion expressed by the Wandsworth Medical Officers, after mature consideration, that the cause of the outbreak was undoubtedly attributable to the use of foul water from the rain-water tank—which was never intended for drinking purposes—is abundantly confirmed by the opinions of the other authorities who inspected the Building. Had other causes been in operation, the other sections of the School would have been affected—whereas the sufferers were the Children of the Junior Section—and the Epidemic would not have so suddenly ceased as it did when the discovery was made of the im-

proper connection of the pipe in the Junior Lavatory with the cistern in the Laundry. This is well pointed out by the Local Medical Officers.

13. But the Committee are unable to accept the conclusion of the Wandsworth Medical Officer that the drinking-water in the tanks at the top of the main tower was impregnated with sewer gas, passing through the rain-water tank and up the overflow pipes. In the first place, the Cesspits are ventilated, and the drains are ventilated between the house and the Cesspits; secondly, the overflow pipe from the rain-water tank is efficiently trapped; and thirdly, if sewer gas had time to generate in the Cesspits, it would be expelled through the apertures in the cover by the daily filling of the pits. Even supposing sewer gas had, notwithstanding these arrangements, gained access to the rain-water tank, it has been forcibly pointed out to the Committee, that the rain-water pipes are most effectively ventilated by the eighty-seven rain-water spouts round the building, all of which have open tops.

14. Of course there is the same liability to contamination in the water supply of the Asylum, as in other places deriving their supplies from the Southwark and Vauxhall Company; and it appeared by the public inquiry, held at Richmond in the early part of this year, that the water furnished by that Company might be impregnated with sewage.

15. There was, unquestionably, a disagreeable smell up the overflow pipes but this could not arise from sewer gas; and it is suggested that it resulted from the manure of birds, and decayed leaves getting into the pipes from the roofs, and during the drought had become objectionable. However, the smell having been pointed out by one of the Local Medical Officers, the connection of the overflow pipes with the rain-water system was severed.

16. The Surveyor of the Local Government Board reported to the President of that Board, that—

> "The Lavatories, Dormitories, and Closets, are, with some slight "exceptions, properly arranged; they are also roomy, convenient, and "well ventilated. In this Department, Water-closets are exclusively used. "They are situate against outer walls, have external light, and means for "Ventilation, and are in position convenient. There are, in the whole, "sixty-one, or about one closet for each five and a half of the inmates. I "found these Closets rigidly clean, and perfectly sweet. The Closets "discharge into drains, the drains into sewers, and the sewers into Cess-"pools, *placed at such a distance from the Buildings as to preclude all just "fear of contamination by Cesspool gases. The Sewers and Drains appear to "be well ventilated.*"

17. Mr. Angell also reports that—

> "The general sanitary arrangements of the Royal Patriotic Fund "Schools on Wandworth Common are exceedingly good, and equal to the "best arrangements of similar Institutions."

Sewage Irrigation.

18. The Local Medical Officers state that they had been unable to discover any direct connection between the Epidemic and the Irrigation of the Grounds with Sewage, or to trace to the latter the actual occurrence of disease; but, having failed in finding any other cause for the then lowered state of health of the inmates, they arrived at the conclusion that Sewage Irrigation ought not to be conducted on the premises under the present conditions.

19. It may not be inappropriate to give here an extract from Mr. Angell's Report on this subject:—

> "I do not agree with the suggestion that either Irrigation or the "alleged non-ventilation of Rain-water Tanks can be identified with the "causes of the outbreak; the facts, in my opinion, are clearly against such "an inference. The Children affected were the most remote from the "Irrigated Ground, in fact, on the opposite side of the Building, but they "recovered when removed to the Infirmary adjacent to irrigated ground. "The Children on the side of the building adjoining the irrigated ground "were not affected. The Boys who actually played on irrigated ground "were not affected, while the Girls affected were not allowed near irrigated "ground. The natural inference, therefore, is that Irrigation, however "conducted, had nothing whatever to do with the matter."

20. Dr. Carpenter also states that—

"The healthy condition of the Boys' School, and the fact that the "Epidemic which affected the Girls so seriously, occurred amongst those "Girls who had nothing to do with the irrigated land and were located "farthest from it, whilst the Boys (many of whom we saw playing upon "land recently irrigated) clearly prove that the illness was not caused by "Irrigation itself. I am fully convinced that it had nothing whatever to "do with the illnesses which have existed among the Girls, otherwise a "different state of things would have existed among the Boys, whilst the "Girls most affected would have been those nearest to the irrigated "grounds, which is not the case."

21. The Local Surveyors consider the ground generally suited for Irrigation purposes; this opinion is confirmed by the eminent authorities who have since examined the premises. Dr. Carpenter expresses the opinion that—

"No more efficient land can be provided for Irrigating purposes than "one containing more ferruginous earth, and this latter appears to be "abundant on the soil of the land now used for the purpose."

Mr. Angell states:—

"With regard to the question of Irrigation, I have already shown "that it does not appear to be identified with the recent outbreak. Land "is the best defæcator of Sewage; and Irrigation, properly conducted, is "proved to be innocuous. *As a matter of comparison I would rather have "the Sewage disposed of by Irrigation on the adjoining lands, than have the "Schools connected with the sewers of Wandsworth or Battersea. Sewer "gases accumulate at the highest point; therefore, I believe the present in-"dependent arrangement is better than union with a system of Public Sewers "culminating on high ground.*"

22. The Proprietors of the 'Lancet' appointed a Commission to collect information from the Chief Public Schools on points connected with their sanitary management. This Commission may be considered to furnish medical opinion of the highest character.

The following is extracted from the Report of that Commission:—

"The relation of the School to the Town.—Diseases originating in "the town can be introduced into the School in three ways. (1) By "emanations from the Sewers and Cesspools; (2) by the supply of "specifically contaminated water; and (3) by direct intercourse with the "townspeople. It is therefore important that a School be isolated as much "as possible from the town, in or near which it is situated. Such, no "doubt, was the condition obtained for our older public Schools at the "time of their foundation. Eton was separated from the town of Windsor "by the River Thames, the growth of the township of Eton being of a "date subsequent to the foundation of the College. At Winchester, the "Cathedral and Close intervened between the College and the Town. "Harrow and Rugby were mere hamlets at the time the Schools were "founded. Now, however, most Schools are more or less surrounded "with houses, and considerable towns have begun to form round them. "In the majority of cases the Schools are connected with the town sewers, "and use the water supplied to the inhabitants generally. Recent sad "occurrences, both at Oxford and Cambridge, have shown how readily "infectious material may be introduced into the College buildings from "without, by either of these channels. *The policy Schools ought to pursue "is to render themselves as independent as possible of the town;* either, as "Winchester is beginning to do, adopt the system of Earth Closets, or, "like Marlborough, secure a system of drainage distinct from the town."

23. The only defect of any importance which the several gentlemen who have inspected the premises point out is in the mode of distributing the sewage; and this the Committee have given directions for remedying so that the discharge on any one day shall be spread over a much larger area of ground than at present; thus there will be much less sewage at any one point, and it will ensure that the effluent water will be thoroughly purified. They have also ordered the periodical renewal of the filtering media in the Tanks and cleansing of the Cesspits.

24. Great as was the anxiety at the time of the Epidemic, and painful in its result in causing the deaths of four little girls, it was fortunate that the obscure cause was discovered, and the Committee have the pleasure of knowing, from the independent testimony of so many competent authorities, that the sanitary defects of so large a building as the Girls' School are of a very trifling character. All bear witness to the good internal arrangements, the Ventilation, the Cleanliness, &c., of the entire establishment, and the Committee feel that it will be a great satisfaction to the Members of the Wandsworth Board of Works, to possess the following extracts from the Monthly Reports of the Medical Officer of the Institution during the recent months:—

"Health of School very satisfactory, no serious cases of illness since "last Report.

"Taking into consideration the extreme changes of temperature of the "past month, I consider the health of the Children exceptionally good.

"Illnesses during the month have been few in number and slight in "character.

"No serious illness since last Report."

And the last, on the 16th of June:

"The Children of this School are in a better state of health than I "have ever seen them during the eleven months that I have been visiting "the Asylum."

25. In conclusion, I am to express the hope that the Members of the Board, or their Officers, either in their public capacities, or as private persons, will not hesitate at any time to visit the Schools in connection with this Commission. Permission to enable them to do so will be readily accorded, and, no doubt, it will be an advantage to the Committee to have defects which may escape their own notice pointed out to them; and by the adoption of such a course, there will be no risk of unauthorized or exaggerated reports being brought under the consideration of the Local Board of Works, who will feel that they possess the means of promptly ascertaining facts.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
WM. H. MUGFORD.
Secretary.

The Clerk of the Board of Works
for the Wandsworth District.

APPENDIX I.

ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC ASYLUM, WANDSWORTH COMMON.

REPORT on the Site, the Sewerage, the General Plan, and Arrangements, and on the Mode and Practice of Sewage Irrigation at the ROYAL VICTORIA PATRIOTIC ASYLUM, situate on Wandsworth Common, London. By ROBERT RAWLINSON, C.B., Civil Engineer, Chief Inspector, Local Government Board.

London, 20*th October*, 1874.

To The RIGHT HON. G. SCLATER-BOOTH, M.P.,
President of the Local Government Board.

SIR,

HAVING been requested by you to communicate with W. H. Mugford, Esq., Secretary to the Governors of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum, for the purpose of inspecting that Institution, and reporting as to its general plan, sewerage, drainage, water-supply, ventilation, and sewage irrigation, I beg respectfully to state, that on Saturday, the 17th instant, in company with Mr. Mugford, I inspected the Girls' Establishment, and on Monday, the 19th instant, in company with Mr. George Hullah, I inspected the Boys' Establishment, and have now to report as follows:—

The Schools have been established since the Crimean War of 1854–55, for

the maintenance and education of Orphan Children of Sailors and Soldiers connected with the Fleet and Army of Great Britain. These Schools are separate blocks of buildings, one for Boys, and one for Girls.

The area of ground is about 52 acres in extent, the site is of good elevation, and it is well situate for external ventilation.

The subsoil is alluvial gravel of a naturally dry character, and it is bounded and isolated on two sides by two main lines of Railway—the London and Brighton Railway on the Northern and Eastern side, the London and South Western on the South Western side.

These lines of railway are in "cuttings," which are from 15 feet to 20 feet below the higher portions of the ground.

It is not my intention to describe the buildings in full detail, but merely to give a brief and general description of them; and more especially to describe those arrangements which may be termed sanitary.

The buildings seem to me to be well placed and admirably planned, and, excepting some slight defects in detail, which I will describe, I think that they may be said to possess most of the arrangements necessary to secure comfort and health to the inmates. They are, in my opinion, a credit to the professional gentleman who designed them, and the Subscribers may feel satisfied that their money has been wisely, and therefore economically, expended. The Governors may also feel justly proud in having the care and supervision of such useful and humane establishments.

Girls' School.

In the Girls' School there were as under:—

Children	319
Adults	28
Total .	347

The lavatories, dormitories, and closets are, with some slight exceptions, properly arranged; they are also roomy, convenient, and well ventilated. In this department water-closets are exclusively used. They are situate against outer walls, have external light, and means for ventilation, and are in position convenient. There are, in the whole, 61, or about one closet for each $5\frac{1}{2}$ of the inmates. I found these closets rigidly clean, and perfectly sweet. The closets discharge into drains, the drains into sewers, and the sewers into cesspools placed at such a distance from the buildings as to preclude all just fear of contamination by cesspool gases. The sewers and drains appear to be well ventilated.

Water Supply.

The main supply of water is from the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Works Company. The water is delivered into 4 large slate cisterns, each 7ft. × 7ft. × 4ft. = 196 cube feet, multiplied by 4 = 784 cube feet, or 4900 gallons in the whole. These tanks are situate in the water-tower, which is well ventilated; the overflow is a 3-inch pipe, which empties over an adjoining roof gutter.

There is a rain water tank below the kitchen-yard 30ft. × 8ft. × 10ft. 6in. = 2520ft. or 15,750 gallons when full.

With the fittings maintained in order the supply of water at command may be considered ample. The slate tanks are supplied from the main by a ball-tap, so that the capacity of these tanks is not the limit of the supply.

The sewers empty into covered cesspools of capacity, as under—

Girls' Establishment.

No. 1.	20ft. × 15ft. × 14ft. =	4200
No. 2.	16ft. × 8ft. × 8ft. =	1024
Total cubic feet .		5224

or 32,650 gallons of sewage in both cesspools. These cesspools or sewage

tanks are underground, but are ventilated. There is a cesspit connected with the sewers from the Boys' Establishment, 9 feet in diameter, and 10 feet in depth below the delivery of the sewer. This sewage tank contains about 3600 gallons of sewage.

Abstract.

	Gallons.
Girls' Establishment . . .	32,650
Boys' „ . . .	3,600
Total . .	36,250

or in round figures, 36,000 gallons of sewage to be disposed of daily.

The surface-water is drained away separately, and the roof-water is utilised for laundry uses as described.

As previously stated, the entire estate contains about 52 acres, and of this, some 35 acres are occasionally irrigated. That is, the sewage is pumped by a steam-engine through iron pipe carriers, laid below the surface, which pipes have hydrants at intervals to which a length of hose is screwed, and through which the sewage flows on to and over the land, care being taken to study the direction of the wind each day, and only to irrigate so that any evaporation shall be blown from the buildings and playgrounds.

The mode of irrigating as now practised is in a degree objectionable, and, but for the very porous character of the ground, might be offensive and injurious to health, as the hose is at times allowed to lie on the ground pouring out sewage at one point until the water stands visibly on the surface in shallow pools.

This sewage is soon absorbed, but it is nevertheless, for the time unsightly and objectionable. Under a proper mode of sewage-irrigation every surface sewage-carrier should shed the sewage in an even and thin film of water over the area irrigated, the volume of sewage being no more than the land will at once absorb without showing anything like a stagnant pool, as is the case at present. To do this there must be an additional expenditure of money to prepare the surface, to form the surface-carriers, and to attend to the even distribution of the sewage. This should be done as soon as practicable.

Boys' Establishment.

Inmates	Boys . . .	300
	Adults . .	17
	Total	317

There are for this department 13 water-closets within the buildings for the Superintendents' use and for night uses in connection with the dormitories. Externally, and for the use of the Boys during the day, there is a stack of 10 earth-closets and 2 earth-urinals. I do not suppose that these earth-urinals and earth-closets breed diarrhœa, but I am satisfied that the arrangement is far more offensive both to sight and to smell than the water-closets are, and in manipulation they are more costly in labour, to prepare the earth, to bring it for use, and then after use to remove it in a sloppy, sodden, stinking state. The arrangement constitutes merely a shallow open cesspool, frequently cleansed, but never sweetened, as there is the ferment of urine and excreta ever present. This arrangement is, in fact, a large open fixed but shallow cesspit, and movable earth closet-boxes are and must be merely small movable open cesspits.

General Remarks.

The windows in the Girls' Establishment (which is the oldest) are iron-framed casements, and in some of the lavatories and closets the opening is so low as to allow the wind to impinge on the necks and heads of the Children if the casement is open. The closets and the lavatories should have full means for ventilation at or near the ceilings, independent of windows open or shut. In the dormitories, the casements in the upper parts, being of iron, rust, and then they stick.

In the Boys' Department (the more recently constructed building) the windows are the ordinary doubly-hung sashes, which may be opened by sliding from the top or the bottom. In my opinion this character and construction of window is to be preferred, as much freer and fuller ventilation can be obtained. The dormitories have windows, and also fixed means for ventilation in addition on both sides, and in some cases there are no doors.

These dormitories contain each from 28 to 32 beds, ranged one row down each side, with about 600 cubic feet of air space to each bed. During the day the windows are opened to air the rooms, and during the night the ventilators, which are near the ceiling, and which communicate direct with the external air, and are never closed night nor day, summer nor winter. In severe weather an extra blanket is allowed to those boys who ask for it.

There are warm-baths in each establishment, and in the Boys' Department there is a swimming-bath lined with white tiles.

The lavatory arrangements are admirable; there is full accommodation, plenty of warm water and cold, plenty of soap, and also plenty of clean towels; the results being healthy, clean-skinned looking children, free from that terrible metropolitan pauper school disease, ophthalmia. Carbolic soap is used, and with advantage. The Children have separate hair-brushes, combs, and tooth-brushes.

The recent outbreak of disease, it was explained to me, may have been caused by defective arrangements in one lavatory in the Girls' Department, which had been supplied by a pump with soft water from the underground rain water tank. The spring and summer of this year were dry, and the water in the tank got low and became foul; this condition was not noticed in time; and though it was not intended that the Children should drink the water, as it was accessible, some of them, it appears, did drink it, and became unwell in consequence. So soon as the cause of illness was discovered, this soft and polluted water supply was cut off, and the Company's water connected, and there have been no similar cases of illness since. With respect to the irrigated ground, the Children are not allowed to go near it at any time, and if they even do so, my experience affords me no reason to suspect that any disease was or would be caused by the irrigation.

Appended are some additional general remarks, which I have not had time to incorporate with this Report by rearranging and rewriting it. To have made a full Report I must have had plans of the estate, of the schools and other buildings, of the sewers and drains, and of the tanks and cesspools. I have, however, satisfied myself that the site, the schools, and the arrangements (with some slight exceptions) are such as may secure comfort and the means of health to the inmates.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
ROBERT RAWLINSON.

There ought to be plans of the sewers, drains, and cesspools at such a scale as to show the position of each drain-junction with the building and with the sewer.

There should also be an enlarged plan of the sewage-tanks, showing how the pumps and suction-pipe are connected.

The iron-casement windows require to be looked to, and the casements to be opened and oiled so as to work easier.

Those casements in the closets and lavatories which open inconveniently, so as to permit the air to blow on the head and neck, should be closed, and the room be ventilated at the ceiling.

Some of the dormitories are better and more fully ventilated than others, those on the upper floors for instance, which have their ceilings taken partially up the rafters; these, however, may have openings in the ceilings to communicate with the space in the roof. Fuller ventilation would be secured by such openings.

The Boys' Chapel is ventilated by circular spaces in the windows which when open admit the air in a block-current, liable to be inconvenient and injurious.

If the Chapel is perfectly ventilated along the ridge, as it easily may be, and ought to be, these circular openings need not be used. In ventilation,

change of air without draughts is to be aimed at; extra clothing should be supplied and used in cold weather, rather than excess of stove dried air, transmitted through flues.

Should bad smells at any time be complained of, the source and cause should be ascertained as soon as possible and the proper remedy be applied. Irrigation need not be abandoned, but the mode of doing it should be altered. The land to be irrigated should be properly prepared and laid out for this purpose by an experienced engineer, and a sewage farmer should be employed, whose business it should be to see that the sewage is applied properly. In my opinion the increased produce to be obtained by first-class sewage farming would pay. Sewage grown grass may be an abundant crop, and cows fed upon it produce more and better milk and butter if the dairy is skilfully managed.

R. R.

APPENDIX J.

Report upon Sanitary Condition of the Girls' School, Royal Patriotic Asylum, Wandsworth Common.

In accordance with instructions conveyed to me by Mr. Mugford, the Secretary to the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund, I visited the School on the 15th, and again on the 21st of October, in company with Mr. Lewis Angell, C.E. I have also repeated my visits alone on two other occasions.

My instructions were to examine into the sanitary condition of the Girls' School; to report upon the causes which had excited the recent epidemics; to determine whether those causes still continued in existence, and, if so, to suggest such alterations as, in my opinion, might be required to prevent future outbreaks.

It appeared that the most recent epidemic had been restricted in its effects to the Junior Girls' quarter, with the exception of four cases among seniors, and all of whom had been employed in the Junior Girls quarter; that it lasted eight days; that fifty-two Children were attacked, of whom four died, all suffering from a particular and unusual form of disease, quite unknown as an epidemic disease among Children, and which pointed to an unusual cause. I concluded, from a due consideration of its character, that this epidemic resulted from the introduction into the system of some animal poison, the force of which fell upon the peritoneum. Its cause was to be sought for in some condition common only to the quarter occupied by the Junior Girls, and which did not apply to the whole School.

Further inquiry showed that the fatal epidemic of September was preceded by one with entirely different symptoms, and which affected Girls in all parts of the School. The symptoms were those of a disease attacking the respiratory tract, commencing with sore throat, slight catarrhal fever, and then an eruption about the lips. This epidemic appeared about the end of July; it lasted about three weeks, affecting a large number of the inmates, and then subsided without producing any anxiety in the mind of your Medical Officer as to the safety of the patients. It was limited to the Girls' School, the Boys not being at all affected by it. Its cause was to be sought, therefore, in some condition peculiar to the Girls, and which could affect them alone.

In addition to these epidemics, an examination of the Medical Officer's Report Books revealed the important fact, that whereas the health of the Boys in the neighbouring building had always been good, that of the Girls for some time past had shown signs of debility; the terms—sick stomach, giddiness, loss of appetite, feverishness, appearing in the Medical Officer's Return, and still more significantly, enlarged glands, erythema, and erysipelas; of these two latter diseases, thirty-seven cases (including relapses and repetitions of the disease) are returned as having occurred within the last four years. None of these diseases appear in the reports regarding the health of the Boys. It was thus evident that the causes which gave rise to these conditions would have to be looked for in the sanitary arrangements belonging to the Girls, and that any conditions which applied equally to both Boys and Girls need not be considered as actual producers of the diseases in question.

The facts clearly pointed out, first, that there was a cause in general operation tending to reduce the health of the Girls to a lower level than that of the Boys. Secondly, to an exceptional condition of things which arose in July, causing the catarrhal fever, and applicable to the whole School; and, lastly, the attack of September, which, being partial in its effects, was probably produced by a cause which was partial in its application.

To solve the problem as to the exciting causes in the three states, appeared to be my duty, and, for that end, I gave my attention in the first instance to—

(1.) The character, arrangement, and distribution of the water supply.
(2.) Then, secondly, the arrangements for the collection of the slops, house refuse, and sewage.
(3.) And, lastly, to the plan adopted for the distribution of the sewage and its removal from the premises.

I had placed at my service various analyses of the water which had been made for the Commissioners by Dr. Dupré, also reports made to the Wandsworth District Board of Works by their Medical Officers and Surveyors, and, at a later period, copy of report of analysis made for the same Board by Dr. Muter.

(1.) *The Character, Arrangements, and Distribution of the Water Supply.*

If any serious evil arose in connection with water, it must have taken place after the main had passed the Boys' School, and the water had been delivered into the tanks provided in the tower of the Girls' School; the supply is from the Southwark and Vauxhall Company. Looking at the analysis provided by Dr. Dupré, I cannot call it good; it has internal evidence of sewage contamination to a slight extent before it is delivered into your premises. The water main passes the Boys' School, supplying that establishment in its course. It gives off a pipe to supply a cattle trough, and after that a service carrying water to out buildings and the Secretary's residence. It does not appear that any of the persons who took their supply of water from this service were in any way affected by the epidemics, though some of them appear in the list of those who had suffered from erysipelas.

The rest of the building was supplied by water which was first delivered into tanks in the central tower. It is filtered by passing through tank No. 1, the filter consisting of shingles, charcoal, and broken shells in separate troughs. It passes from the third trough into three other tanks, each of which supplies a different part of the building. An examination of the analysis made by Dr. Dupré showed that the water was not improved by filtration, a trace of nitrous acid appeared after the process, and the volatile matters existed in larger quantities than before filtration. This indicated that the filter itself contained decomposing matter, which is also conclusively proved by the condition of the water which was taken from the same place after the filtering material had been stirred up. The second analysis showed more nitrous acid, a strong trace of phosphoric acid, and a largely increased quantity of volatile matters, whilst organic nitrogen is in excessive quantity for potable water; the organic matter amounted to thirty-six grains in the gallon. There are some differences in these analyses which are not to be easily accounted for, and tend to decrease their value for correct quantitative inference; but still it is evident that the conclusions I have drawn are correct without requiring that every point in the analyses should be explained. The condition of the water supply, as provided by the Company, accounts for the condition of the filter. We find, from independent sources, the existence of animalculæ sufficient of themselves, with other organic matter shown to be present, to foul the filter, and in time render it incompetent to perform its duty. It did not appear that the erysipelas cases were limited to Girls consuming water from any one tank; the catarrhal cases were not so limited, but the peritoneal cases were found only among the Junior Girls, who were supposed to draw their supply from No. 3 tank. I could not find that any difference existed between the water in this tank and the general supply; but I was informed by your Secretary that it had been discovered during the process of the peritoneal epidemic that the little Girls had been accustomed to drink water from the taps in their lavatory, and

that it had also been discovered that this supply was derived from a cistern in the roof of the laundry; it was known that the cistern itself was filled from a rain water tank in the kitchen yard. An analysis of this water has been made by Dr. Dupré, and clearly shows that it had become seriously contaminated with organic matter, and, but for the positive evidence afforded by the condition of the tank, I should have concluded that some percolation had taken place into it from some sewage contaminated source, as there is evidence of much nitrogen in its composition. It appears also to be conclusively certain that the epidemic ceased immediately this source of supply was removed. I therefore consider this tank, or the cistern supplied from it, to be the disseminator of the cause of peritoneal disease among the younger Children. The rain water is collected into this tank by means of eighty-seven stack pipes, all of which are untrapped, and would act as ventilators to the tank itself. It is said that the bottom of the tank contained much of that kind of matter which is usually found at the bottom of a rain water tank, and it is suggested in one of the reports that foul air found its way up to the tanks in the tower from this source; the overflow-pipe from the tower going into this tank. I do not think this is likely to have been the case, as such foul air would have to pass by the eighty-seven stack pipes to get there. Nevertheless, I consider that the peritoneal disorder had its origin in water from this source, or from the cistern in the laundry, which is filled from the rain water tank, and which is much more likely to have been impregnated with foul air from the tank, because its overflow goes directly into the tank, and might be the first outlet for such if it did arise at all at this place, and so to get admission to the rain-water delivery pipe. I am of opinion that, by some means or other, the excreta, or some exuviæ, from some one or other of the erysipelatous cases found its way into this water supply, and that such animal matter set up the peritoneal inflammation which affected the Junior Girls.

It is known to medical men that there is an intimate relationship between erysipelas and puerperal peritonitis, the history of those cases seem also to connect them as cause and effect. This, it is true, is a theory only, the cause was probably removed before it could be discovered, but it appears to me the only possible solution of the mysterious attack of September. Assuming that Dr. Dupré's analysis is to be depended upon, it is evident that some percolation did take place into the rain water tank, for the analysis reveals the important fact, that, in addition to the quantity of permanganate required for its purification it had $10\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of hardness, 6 of which remained after boiling, whilst in rain water nothing of the kind should be found. It is suggestive also, that whilst the Company's water only has $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 degrees after boiling, this had 6; showing that the water in the tank had obtained lime from some new source in addition to that which is in the Company's water. That the contamination I have suggested is possible is evident, for we find four cases of erysipelas in the School in the month preceding the outbreak; that as their clothes were washed in the laundry, it is quite possible even for water in the cistern in the laundry roof to get contaminated by the steaming matters from the laundry itself, or by some accidental contamination of the water in the cistern even if no sewer gases could get into the tank from the sewer with which the tank indirectly communicated by its overflow pipe. It is clear that if such gases carrying germs of disease could find their way from the sewer into the tank, the course into the cistern would be clear enough, but this would not account for the increased hardness of the water.

An inquiry as to the source of water for use in the water-closets of the building brought out the important fact that the water supply for dietetic purposes is taken from the same tanks as is the supply for flushing purposes. There are 38 closets, taking their supply from the general stock, of which 14 are in the main building. The closets principally used by the Girls are those in the playsheds, which are 24 in number. It appears to me that this is a serious defect, unless the closets are supplied by separate water waste preventive cisterns, because there will otherwise always be a portion of the supply pipe in each case emptied after the use of the water-closet, and the empty space in the pipe will be supplied with air from an impure source. I believe this action of intermittent water supply will explain to some extent the presence of phosphoric acid in the analysis made by Dr. Dupré, as well as its presence in the water from the Company's main, because the danger is not limited to the

school premises, but obtains all over a district with constant water supply in which the dietetic supply and flushing power are obtained from the same sources.

There is a mere trace in each case, but its actual presence is indicative of fœcal contamination, which may have been produced in the manner I have indicated. An effort should be made to allow of every water-closet and the latrines likewise being provided with water from a separate source. This, as far as the water-closets are concerned, can be effected by adding a water waste preventive cistern to each.

That much foul air could find access to the water supply from the latrines is manifest, because more than a hundred feet of pipe is emptied between the stop-cock, from which the latrines and urinals are flushed, and the latrines themselves, every time the pipe is used. The air contained in this pipe will, most of it, find its way upwards into the mains, and will be absorbed by the water in its transit, or will escape from the supply pipes which are in use on the water pipe itself. A very few germs of decomposing organic matter from an affected person would be certain in this way to give the disease to those who drink the infected water.

(2.) *The Arrangement for the Collection of Slops, House Refuse, and Sewage generally.*

We made special inquiry as to the method adopted for the collection of the sewage from the various parts of the building. The information afforded was not full, in consequence of the absence of accurately detailed plans; we examined the arrangements in the lavatories, the water-closets, baths, urinals, and latrines, all these appeared to be in excellent working order. The only serious defect that I could find, was, that very little allowance is made for the ventilation of the house drains. Many of the soil pipes (of which there are 14 in the main building), are bell glasses containing stagnant air, by means of which an impure air is certain to be admitted at times into the house, especially in the night, when windows are closed and doors are shut.

A small, but judicious attempt had been made to remedy this defect at the south-west angle of the main building, but the principle requires to be adopted on a larger scale to every soil-pipe. It is not proved that any great evil had proceeded from this cause, but it appeared to me as one likely to assist in lowering the general health of the inmates, and an easy means of introducing the germs of other diseases into the building, and that it should be completely remedied.

The sewage is collected by 9-inch earthenware pipe drains, emptying into a cesspit at the distance of 125 yards from the south side of the Girls' School, which cuts off immediate communication between the cesspools and the house. From this receptacle the sewage passes into a cesspool which is in duplicate, and each capable of holding about 20,000 gallons of sewage. From these cesspools the sewage is pumped by steam power on to the land, and is used for purposes of irrigation. Near to them is the circular cesspool, for the Boys' School, which is 32ft. deep, by 9 in diameter.

The cesspools are covered by perforated wood flaps, which allow the escape of any gases which may be formed in the cesspools into the atmosphere, and prevents its accumulation. It was stated that the inlets for sewage from the building were never covered by the sewage rising above them, so that no extensive passage of sewer gases could have taken place up the sewers into the building. It is, however, to be borne in mind, that in the event of this occurring, and it may, from obvious reasons, occur oftener than is known to your Secretary, there might, indeed, would be a rapid conveyance of such gases into the soil-pipes of all the water-closets in the house in certain states of the wind, notwithstanding the intervention of the small cesspit between the cesspools and the main sewers.

It appeared, also, from the Medical Officer's Report Book, that certain discharges of sewer gases did take place in some way, at the end of July, into the Girls' latrines and the urinals adjacent to their playgrounds, for a report appears in your Medical Officer's Report Book, detailing such escape, and suggesting a partially appropriate remedy which was immediately carried out; and, from a consideration of all these circumstances, I am led to infer that the

catarrhal epidemic of July and August had its origin in the discharge of sewer gases at the Girls' latrines, the sewer gases carrying germs of animal poison into contact with the mucous membrane of the Girls affected. The epidemic differed from that of September, inasmuch as it was not restricted to one class of Girls, but affected all parts of the establishment, and whilst the last showed its effect upon the alimentary canal, this was much slighter, attacking the throat and nasal organs, being attended only by slight fever, indicative of some condition similar to the exanthematous class of diseases. The symptoms pointed to inhalation of gaseous matter conveying fever germs, and an examination of the latrines on one side of the Girls' playground, indicated from whence the cause had proceeded. This defect had been partially remedied previous to my inspection; but, I have no doubt, that sewer gases did find their way most freely into the latrines at the end of July, and that those sewer gases did convey into the Children germs of changing organic matter which gave rise to the catarrh or febricula and its attendant eruption about the lips. I have frequently had reason to connect catarrh with similar causes, and generally suffer myself from a catarrh with herpetic eruptions about the lips, after exposure to certain kinds of sewer gas exhalations.

I do not think it at all likely that the gaseous discharges from the cesspools at their opening in the field, produced the evil, as the dilution to which such would be exposed, would render them comparatively innocuous before they could reach the Children's playground, but that the cause found its way out of the sewer in the latrines. At the same time I consider the existence of the cesspools, a source of weakness to the establishment, by always having at hand a state of things which may bring danger, viz., sewage in a state of active decomposition, without the antagonistic influences, which exist when it is used up immediately by irrigation. The sewage being allowed to change to hurtful matter by unnecessary delay.

(3.) *Lastly, as to the Plan of Distribution of the Sewage, and its Removal from the Premises.*

This is effected by means of steam power, the sewage being raised from the cesspools to certain points, which enable the hydrants to command about 34 acres of land. The principle adopted is a combination of the principle of surface irrigation, with intermittent downward filtration, the latter being the predominant feature. About two-thirds of the irrigated land is grass land, being ordinary meadow; the remainder is vegetable garden. More than three-fourths of the sewage is used on the meadow land. The soil is admirably fitted for the purpose, but the principle adopted is ineffectual and unsatisfactory.

This is the more to be regretted; no more efficient land can be provided for irrigating purposes than one containing much ferruginous earth, and this latter appears to be abundant in the soil of the land now used for the purpose.

The land has been under-drained; subsoil drains receive the effluent water and convey it to a dumb well close to the Boys' School; an examination of this effluent showed clearly enough that very little of the soluble matter contained in the sewage had been taken out, and that irrigation has been nominal. A qualitative examination of the effluent as it ran down the railway bank was made, and showed the presence of considerable quantities of ammonia, and much nitrates and nitrites. The presence of large numbers of animalcular life gave evidence to a freedom from dangerous gas exhalations. For the presence of such life contra-indicates the presence of dangerous exhalations. I do not place much reliance on certain other analyses which I have had an opportunity of referring to, but, taking them as qualitative only, they corroborate my ideas as to the present imperfect way in which the sewage of the School generally is purified. The healthy condition of the Boys' School, and the fact that the epidemic which affected the Girls so seriously occurred among those Girls who had nothing to do with the irrigated land, and were located farthest from it, whilst the Boys (many of whom we saw playing upon land recently irrigated) were not in the least affected, clearly prove that the illness was not caused by irrigation itself. I must, however, condemn the manner in which irrigation is practised, yet I am fully convinced that it had nothing whatever to do with the illnesses which have existed among the Girls, otherwise

a different state of things would have existed among the Boys, whilst the Girls most affected would have been those nearest to the irrigated grounds, which is not the case.

I believe I have accounted for the peritonitis and the catarrhal fever, but not for the erysipelas and the other evidences of a lowered state of health. That this lowered state is a fact is shown by the long list of cases in the Medical Officers' Books during the past four years, as well as the higher rate of mortality which has appeared in later years at the Girls' School.

The School has been established fifteen years, and taking the inmates in round numbers at 300, it appears that the death-rate for each five years from

1860 to 1864 = 2·66
1865 to 1869 = 6·66
1870 to 1874 = 13·33

The first ten years of the School shows an extremely low death-rate, but the last five is comparatively high, considering the ages of the Children, although some allowance must be made for the character of the Children admitted; but as the Boys are taken from the same ranks, whatever is wrong as far as stock is concerned in one would equally affect the other, and the death-rate among the Boys is nothing like so great.

I think the health of the Girls was lowered:—1st, and slightly only, by the presence of impure air in their rooms from imperfect sewer ventilation. To this the Boys are scarcely subjected as they do not have water-closets in the building.

I expected to find defective ventilation in the dormitories or in the class-rooms, as the maladies most frequent among the Girls are generally due to excess of carbonic acid in the atmosphere, and the presence of repeatedly rebreathed air. I am bound to say that my anticipations were not realised, as both class-rooms and dormitories appeared to be well ventilated.

2nd. The impure water supply of the Southwark and Vauxhall Company rendered more impure by the defective filter.

There is one other point upon which I have not sufficient evidence to justify more than a mention here. It appears that the Girls were fed with Australian meat twice weekly, from the time at which decided evidence of debility appeared, namely, from 1871, until the endof September last.

How far that diet is directly responsible for the result I am unable to determine, but the health of the Children has been better since the end of September when that particular diet was discontinued, and there is evidence afforded by your Medical Officer, that on several occasions there was a distinct connection between a meal of Australian meat and a peculiar rash, similar to nettle-rash, which attacked several Children on several occasions, and the only thing in common was the food. These rashes did not make their appearance at other times, and, if the meat had anything to do with the stomach attacks, they would certainly tend to reduce the general health instead of improving it. The Boys do not appear to have had the diet; they did not have Australian meat; they did not have sewer gas from unventilated soil-pipes of water-closets. The Girls are probably more within doors than the Boys, and the water they consumed having to pass through a filter which had been in operation for many more years than the Boys', all these causes assisted to diminish their vital power and make them more susceptible to injurious influences from other sources when they happened to become exposed to them.

SUGGESTIONS:—

(1.) That all the soil-pipes in all parts of the building be ventilated between the trap of the water-closet and latrine and the sewer, and that the ventilator be nearly equal in diameter to the soil-pipe; that it be placed as close to the trap as is practicable (without right angles upon it), and that it be carried up some distance above the water-closet or latrine.

(2.) That all the communications between the baths, wash-basins, or over-flow-pipes be cut off from immediate connection with the sewer, and that the communications be indirect only.

(3.) That every water-closet have a supply of water not immediately derived from the pipe which conveys water for dietetic purposes.

This can be done by placing water-waste preventive cisterns between the main supply and the water-closet.

(4.) That the flushing tap which conveys the water for flushing the latrines and urinals be brought as close as possible to the latrines, so that no exhausted pipe should be allowed to exist between the latrine and the water-tanks. These alterations, together with those suggested in Nos. 2 and 3, will prevent the possibility of water contamination on the premises.

(5.) That the plan now adopted of collecting the sewage into cesspools be abolished and the present imperfect plan of irrigation be done away.

That if irrigation be continued, but in a proper manner, to which I see no possible objection, it should be by broad irrigation and rye-grass purification, the sewage being obliged to pass over and through the land and not allowed to escape in the way it does at present into the underground drains. A proper cultivation of rye-grass would provide sufficient food for the cows of the establishment, and purify the sewage in a satisfactory manner, which the present arrangement does not allow of. It should also be applied fresh, and not remain long enough to produce the putrifactive odours which must attend upon the present plan. Cattle should not be allowed to stray upon the land under actual irrigation, and I should suggest that the Boys be prevented from doing so likewise, and that their playground should not be irrigated as is done at present.

I have to thank your Medical Officer, Mr. St. Aubyn Hawken for much valuable information; and also your energetic Secretary, Mr. Mugford, who has quickly and fully complied with the many requisitions I have made upon his time. Without his assistance I should have been quite unable to form any definite opinion upon the case which has been submitted to me.

I should also wish to express my entire approbation of the cleanliness and order which reigns throughout the Schools as far as they came under my cognisance.

ALFRED CARPENTER, M.D.

CROYDON, *December 3rd*, 1874.

APPENDIX K.

12, *Dartmouth Street, Great Queen Street, Westminster, S.W., and Town Hall, Stratford, E.*
London, Dec. 22, 1874.

To W. H. MUGFORD, Esq., R.N.,
Secretary to the Royal Commission of the Patriotic Fund.

SIR,

IN accordance with your instructions I have, in company with Dr. Carpenter, made a careful examination of the internal and external arrangements of the Girls' Schools, also the condition of the Boys' Ground on Wandsworth Common, with special reference to sanitary matters.

I found the general internal arrangements so excellent, that I am able fully to confirm the Medical Officers and Surveyors of the Wandsworth Board in the remark that they are of an "exceptionally good character."

The structural details, workmanship, and appliances were in every respect equal to the best practice and knowledge of the period when they were designed and executed.

I was informed by the Medical Officer and yourself of the various facts relating to the recent outbreak of illness in the Institution; I have also read the Reports of the officers of the Wandsworth Board of Works thereon.

The "epidemic" was, by common consent, attributed to the drinking of foul rain water through a lavatory defect which had been altered before my inspection. I did not discover in the mechanical arrangements anything of an exceptional kind which could reasonably account for such an outbreak.

I do not agree with the suggestion that either irrigation or the alleged non-ventilation of rain water tanks can be identified with the causes of the outbreak; the facts, in my opinion, are clearly against such an inference. The children affected were the most remote from the irrigated ground, in fact, on

the opposite side of the building, but they recovered when removed to the infirmary adjacent to irrigated ground. The children on the side of the building adjoining the irrigated ground were not affected. The boys who actually played on irrigated ground were not affected, while the girls affected were not allowed near irrigated ground. The natural inference therefore is that irrigation, however conducted, had nothing whatever to do with the matter.

With regard to the non-ventilation of the rain water tank, and the access of sewer gas through overflow pipes to the drinking water tanks, I found no less than 87 untrapped rain spouts from the roofs, freely open to the air at the eaves, and directly communicating with the tank, each one therefore forming a ventilator. The small overflow pipes, objectionable as they are, had practically but little to do with the ventilation of the rain tank, as compared with the large sectional area of each of the 87 down spouts.

The drinking water is supplied from the mains of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company, who are therefore primarily responsible for its purity. The water traverses a considerable length of main through the grounds of the Institution before arriving at the tanks in the tower. The Institution is therefore responsible for the protection of the water in transit and during storage. A filtering arrangement exists in the first tank, which, if periodically renewed, is a protection against previous pollution, but unless such filtering media are from time to time renewed, the arrangement may, in the end, be productive of more harm than good.

Contamination of the drinking water would result in the whole establishment being affected more or less by the same general symptoms, but as such does not appear to have been the case, we may infer that no serious contamination of the water from any cause has occurred.

I cannot therefore discover any special or general cause in the existing arrangements, from an engineering point of view, to account for exceptional illness or give cause for alarm.

But of late special attention has been directed to the minutiæ of sanitary details, so that a refinement now exists in these matters which did not obtain a few years ago. Consequently the modern sanitarian may, without adverse criticism, suggest many improvements on existing arrangements.

The soil pipe of every closet should be ventilated by an upward pipe free to the open air above the roof, to prevent the upcast of sewer air into the closet when flushed.

No waste or overflow pipes from sinks, baths, lavatories, or tanks, should communicate directly with any soil, drain, or cesspool, but should discharge into the open air, or a trapped receiver, free from sewer air.

A defect of the latter kind was discovered by Dr. Carpenter in the case of a latrine flushing pipe supplied from, and communicating directly with, a drinking water tank in the tower. The flushing pipe had an intermediate stop-cock, between which and the latrine end of the pipe, a considerable length, foul air would accumulate when not in use, and, when the cock opened, force its way *up the pipe* into the tank, through which the gas would bubble and possibly be taken up in solution.

A careful examination should therefore be made of the drainage and supply pipes of every description throughout the building, so as to discover and remedy any features not in accordance with the above suggestions.

With regard to the question of irrigation, I have already shown that it does not appear to be identified with the recent outbreak. Land is the best defæcator of sewage; and irrigation, properly conducted, is proved to be innocuous. As a matter of comparison I would rather have the sewage disposed of by irrigation on the adjoining lands, than have the Schools connected with the sewers of Wandsworth or Battersea. Sewer gases accumulate at the highest point, therefore I believe the present independent arrangement is better than union with a system of public sewers culminating on high ground.

But there is room for improvement in the system of irrigation at present adopted. Storage of sewage in cesspools is objectionable; they form reservoirs for gas which may ascend the drains. There should be no stagnation; fresh sewage is harmless, but its retention involves the generation and evolution of gases. The sewage should, as far as practicable, flow directly on to the

ground; this might be done to a considerable extent by gravitation, but I have not sufficiently examined this point. The surface of the ground should be so formed and regulated as to secure a regular flow, and avoid swamping. The cultivation of rye-grass would also be attended with advantages over the present system. If the irrigation be continued, these matters require attention.

Irrigation over the Boys' playground is objectionable; the portions irrigated should be fenced off.

The objectionable character of the effluent water in the receptacle, called a well by Dr. Muter, near the Boys' School, is due to shallow under-drainage; the water percolates quickly through the very porous soil, and is collected by the drains before purification is completed.

The result of some of the analyses of the drinking water would appear to show a deterioration after leaving the Company's street mains. A water pipe in sewage irrigated ground, is, unless under constant pressure, in danger of being contaminated by the leakage of effluent sewage, such as described by Dr. Muter from the Boys' well; the joints of such a pipe should be well puddled with clay.

The drains discharging into the sewage reservoirs or cesspools should be furnished at their ends with hanging flaps, to prevent the ascent of sewer air. The drains should also have openings in the ground for ventilation.

As the result of my investigations, I submit the following conclusions:—

That the general sanitary arrangements of the Royal Patriotic Schools on Wandsworth Common are exceedingly good, and equal to the best arrangements of similar Institutions.

That irrigation, properly conducted, is not objectionable on the grounds of the Institution.

That impaired health cannot be traced to existing structural or sanitary arrangements.

That while recognising the general excellence of the sanitary arrangements, they are open to further improvement in details which I have indicated.

I have to acknowledge the readiness and courtesy with which every information and assistance was so freely rendered by yourself and Mr. Hawken, your Medical Officer, during my investigation.

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,
LEWIS ANGELL,
M. Inst. C.E., Hon. Fellow King's Coll., Lond.
President of the Association of Municipal and Sanitary Engineers, &c., &c.

APPENDIX L.

20 *North Street, Wandsworth,*
March 9th, 1875.

Dear Mr. Mugford,

1. I have received and carefully perused the Reports of Messrs. Rawlinson, Angell, and Carpenter, respecting the sanitary condition, &c., of the Royal Patriotic Schools on Wandsworth Common.

2. Dr. Carpenter's careful and minute Report embodies all that it becomes necessary to remark on in the other papers, and I ought at once to say that, speaking generally, I consider that his "Report and Suggestions" are sound and good, and prove that he has given the subject the consideration it deserves.

He very ably endeavours to account for the four conditions of the Children's health, that were such a source of anxiety to the Royal Commissioners, and I may add, to myself, in the autumn of last year:

1st. The generally impaired health of the Children in the Girls' School.
2nd. The Catarrhal Fever.
3rd. The Erysipelas.
4th. The fatal Peritonitis.

3. I think the inquiry into these four states may be brought into a much narrower compass than in Dr. Carpenter's paper. There never has been a doubt, as far as I know, in the minds of the six Professional Gentlemen (including the late Dr. Anstie), who have inquired into the subject, that the Rain Water was the cause of the unfortunately fatal epidemic of September last. In what way that water became poisoned, so as to produce the Peritonitis, can now be merely conjecture; but knowing, as Dr. Carpenter says, "the intimate relationship between Erysipelas and Puerperal Peritonitis," and having had a painful and fatal example of it in private practice during my attendance on the Erysipelas cases, necessitating my immediately handing over all prospective obstetrical cases to a medical friend for a considerable period, I think it quite probable that this water became so influenced by the Erysipelatous cases, in the way described by Dr. Carpenter, as to set up Peritoneal Inflammation in those drinking it.

4. The Erysipelas I am quite convinced was the result of the Catarrhal Fever; there were so many cases, amongst the latter complaint, of such excessive Herpetic eruptions about the lips and nose that they appeared only in a degree removed from that which seemed likely in a few hours to develope into a true Erysipeloid affection of the face, and all the cases of Erysipelas that occurred commenced in this way.

5. From this it will be seen that the fatal Peritonitis was probably the result of the Erysipelas, and that the Erysipelas was the result of the Catarrhal Fever; hence our inquiry is narrowed into the discovery of the cause of the Catarrhal Fever.

6. I fear that I must have omitted to inform Dr. Carpenter of one fact that seems to me particularly worthy of consideration in connection with these epidemics.

7. You will of course remember that about two-thirds of the Children in the Girls' School returned from their annual holidays on or about the 3rd of July last, and that the remaining third had never left the Asylum. The Catarrhal Fever commenced almost immediately on the return of these children; the first case appearing on the 5th of July, four others on the 7th, and that it went on gradually increasing up to the 11th of August, when no less than 148 had become affected.

8. No case of fever occurred amongst the 100 girls who had never left the School, until the *return* of the holiday Children.

9. This makes it certain that if any poisonous gas was eliminated, it must have taken place immediately on the *return* of these Children, and to say the least, it was curious that it should have occurred directly on their arrival, and that although no alteration of any importance has since taken place in the sanitary arrangements of the Buildings, the epidemic should have so completely subsided before the end of October, and that since that time there has not been a single case having a vestige of the character of those outbreaks.

10. Taking all this into consideration, and remembering that the Chief Inspector of the Local Government Board says in his Report to the Right Hon. G. Sclater-Booth, M.P., that "the Buildings are well placed and admirably planned, and excepting some slight defects in detail . . . . possess most of the arrangements necessary to secure comfort and health to the inmates, and that they are a credit to the professional gentleman who designed them," &c., it seems to me to point very strongly indeed in favour of the whole outbreaks having been introduced through the Catarrhal Fever from some *outside* conditions. I know that for some time before and after our illnesses commenced, Catarrhal Fever and Erysipelas were very prevalent in many districts of the Metropolis, and that there were a great number of cases in Wandsworth and Putney, and in Battersea many of a severe and fatal character.

11. The one other condition now left for consideration is that which has tended to reduce the health of the Girls to a lower level than that of the Boys. In considering this, it ought not, I think, to be overlooked that Girls are, generally speaking, of a less robust habit of body than the opposite sex; and again, that they have not the same amount of exhilarating exercise as Boys; but after making allowance for this, I do not think the Children in the Girls' School are in as good a condition as the attention and care bestowed on their comforts would lead one to suppose they should be.

12. There is always a larger list of minor ailments than one would expect

to find. Festers, enlarged glands and debility being the most frequent of the cases brought up for treatment; but besides these, a large number of the Children, even during the mild days, have a bluish purple colour of the face and extremities, showing an excess of carbonic acid in the blood. Supposing that any gaseous poison is existent in or about the Schools, such a condition of body is easily accounted for, as the poison is inhaled into the lungs, where, meeting a large absorbent surface, it instantly enters the blood. Children with this excess of carbonic acid are very ripe for receiving the germs of any disease with which they may be brought into contact, and this, from whatever cause brought about, accounts, I think, for the extremely rapid way in which so many Children caught the Catarrhal Fever in so short a period last autumn.

13. It is this state of the Children that I should like to see removed more than any other, because I look upon it as the originator of the enlarged glands, and most of the minor ailments that I have had to treat.

14. Repeatedly rebreathed air, impure food and water or sewer gases may cause it. The two first named, I think, we may be satisfied have nothing to do with it.

15. That the water supplied to the Schools is not good has been shown by Dr. Dupré's analysis, and also by the extensive deposits in the tanks both before and after filtration, and the water-closets being supplied from the same tanks as those used for Dietetic purposes, may occasionally be a source of increasing the already existing impurity.

16. Sewer gases undoubtedly exist at times, but I feel bound to say that during my daily visits for the last eight months, it has been but seldom that I have detected anything worthy of notice.

17. In conclusion, I would again remark that I consider Dr. Carpenter's "Suggestions" sound and good, and should the Committee carry out one or all of them, they can only be for the benefit of the Institution.

I remain,
Yours faithfully,
C. ST. AUBYN HAWKEN,
Visiting Surgeon to the Royal Patriotic Schools.

W. H. Mugford, Esq.

APPENDIX M.

Royal Commission of the Patriotic Fund,
3 St. Martin's Place, Trafalgar Square,
London, W.C.
13th July, 1875.

Dear Sir,

The Executive and Finance Committee have carefully considered the Report which you prepared after your inspections of the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum for Girls.

2. Since your visits an examination has been made of the whole of the places, round the main building, where the rain-water drains and the soil drains cross each other. There was only one defect discovered of a slight oozing in a joint of a soil drain, but the soil drain was *below* the rain-water pipe, and this latter was in perfect condition. In only one instance was a soil-pipe above a rain-water pipe. So that no sewage contamination could have got into the rain-water tank in that way.

3. Stop-cocks have very recently been put close to the play-sheds, on two of the flushing pipes of the latrines connected with them. On exposing those pipes for the purpose of putting the stop-cocks on, the lower parts of them were found full of water. From the fact of the ends of the pipes where they depart from the main building being of a higher level than the closets, and the pipes rising suddenly from under the surface of the ground to the closets, they trap themselves, as portions of the pipes are never empty. The third pipe did not draw its supply from the main building, but from the cistern in the

engine-house. The Committee have ordered a cistern to be placed in each shed for the water supply of the latrines.

4. Orders have also been given that the direct communication between the baths, wash-basins, and overflow pipes shall be severed; and ventilating pipes are gradually being attached to the soil drains of the closets.

5. That the water supply may have been contaminated by sewage before its entry into our premises, will be apparent from the evidence given at the Richmond inquiry in the early part of this year.

Mr. Jabez Hogg, M.R.C.S.E., stated that—

> "On January 11th the witness received another bottle of water, "which, on standing, deposited a considerable amount of sediment, which "afforded evidence of a serious contamination from sewage and other "causes. It was filthily dirty. The animals referred to were active "ingredients in the production of blood-poisoning among human beings. "However much filtered, Thames water does contain a very large amount "of matter injurious to health. It was supposed that 600,000 people, "residing on the banks of the Thames, drain into the river above "Hampton. From the improved means of filtering, the water companies "were able to keep back the gross particles of animal and mineral matter "from the Thames water, so that it looked bright when poured into a "tumbler. But it was well known that bacteria and other deleterious "animals passed in every drop of water through the best filter."

And Dr. Thudichum, a Member of the Royal College of Physicians, of the Royal College of Surgeons, and other learned Societies, said—

> "That he had been frequently employed by the Medical Depart- "ment of the Privy Council to make inquiries. He had devoted con- "siderable attention to the effect of water supply on disease, and was "of opinion that deep well water was vastly superior to Thames water, "however much filtered. There could be no doubt that the water above "Teddington Lock was contaminated, not only by channels of which we "know, but from a number of unknown channels. It would take fifty years "to clear the water, even if all contamination ceased. The water might "convey disease into the human body, or might predispose to disease.

6. I enclose a copy of Mr. Hawken's letter, which contains a very important statement with reference to the Catarrhal Fever of last summer. The following is the statement I allude to :—

> "I fear I must have omitted to inform Dr. Carpenter of one fact that "seems to me particularly worthy of consideration in connection with "these epidemics.
>
> "You will of course remember that about two-thirds of the children "in the Girls' School returned from their annual holidays on or about the "3rd of July last, and that the remaining third had never left the Asylum. "The Catarrhal Fever commenced almost immediately on the return of "these children, the first case appearing on the 5th of July, four others "on the 7th, and that it went on gradually increasing up to the 11th of "August, when no less than 148 had become affected. No case of fever "occurred amongst the 100 Girls who had never left the school until the "*return* of the holiday children. That makes it certain that if any "poisonous gas was eliminated, it must have taken place immediately on "the *return* of these children, and, to say the least, it was curious that it "should have occurred directly on their arrival, and that although no "alteration of any importance has since taken place in the sanitary "arrangements of the buildings, the epidemic should have so completely "subsided before the end of October, and that since that time there has "not been a single case having a vestige of the character of those "outbreaks."

7. The Laundry-maids are, of course, frequently outside the premises visiting their friends and acquaintances, and the possibility of their having on some of these occasions become infected with Erysipelas, and so have introduced it to the building, has been suggested.

8. There is one important particular in your Report to which I am to request your attention: it is in reference to the death-rate, where you have

unconsciously fallen into an error, from your having assumed that there has always been an average of 300 Girls in the Asylum, whereas in the period from 1860 to 1864, the average was 257—

Which would make the death-rate for that period	3·11 instead of	2·66
From 1865 to 1869 it was 251, making . .	7·88 ,, ,,	6·66
And from 1870 to 1874 the number was 323, making the rate	12·38 ,, ,,	13·35

But if the deaths from the epidemic be excluded, the death-rate for that period would be reduced to 9·90.

I remain,
Dear Sir,
Very truly yours,
WM. H. MUGFORD,
Secretary.

DR. ALFRED CARPENTER,
High Street, Croydon.

"CAPTAIN" RELIEF

Dr. STATEMENT of RECEIPT and EXPENDITURE

RECEIPTS.				AMOUNT.
				£ s. d.
Interest and Dividends received, viz.—				
Per cent.		£	s. d.	
£11,915 at 5	On Canada Inscribed Stock	294	3 0	
11,000 „ 5	On Madras Railway Stock	271	11 3	
13,100 „ 5	On New South Wales Bonds 1888–1900	323	8 1	
				889 2 4
	Balance Dr. as per Contra			1,363 10 1
			£	2,252 12 5

APPENDIX

"CAPTAIN" RELIEF

STATEMENT of RECEIPT and EXPENDITURE

RECEIPTS.				AMOUNT.
				£ s. d.
Interest and Dividends received, viz.—				
Per cent.		£	s. d.	
£11,915 at 5	On Canada Inscribed Stock	272	14 2	
11,000 „ 5	On Madras Railway Stock	294	19 6	
13,100 „ 5	On New South Wales Bonds, 1888–1900	324	15 5	
				892 9 1
To amount of Income Tax returned by Commissioners of Inland Revenue				23 18 5
	Balance Dr. as per Contra			2,221 10 8
			£	3,137 18 2

FUND ACCOUNT.

between 1st *January* and 30th *June*, 1874. *Cr.*

EXPENDITURE.				AMOUNT.		
				£	*s.*	*d.*
Balance on last Account				272	7	0
Amount of Allowances paid to Widows, Orphans, and Relatives				1,830	6	8
Paid as Percentage to Staff-Officers of Pensioners				55	19	11
Office Salaries				50	0	0
Stationery and Printing				5	8	0
Transfer to Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum				38	10	10
	£	*s.*	*d.*			
Cash at Bank of England	1,350	13	7			
Due to War Office	2,714	3	8			
Balance Dr.	1,363	10	1			
£				2,252	12	5

N—*continued.*

FUND ACCOUNT.

between 1st *July* and 31st *December*, 1874.

EXPENDITURE.				AMOUNT.		
				£	*s.*	*d.*
Balance on last Account				1,363	10	1
Amount of Allowances paid to Widows, Orphans, and Relatives				1,670	17	2
Paid as Percentage to Staff-Officers of Pensioners				51	7	5
Office Salaries				50	0	0
Stationery and Printing				2	3	6
	£	*s.*	*d.*			
Cash at Bank of England	2,214	17	7			
Due to War Office	4,436	8	3			
Balance Dr.	2,221	10	8			
£				3,137	18	2

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET
AND CHARING CROSS.

ALKALI ACTS, 1863 AND 1874.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons, dated 7 April 1876;—*for*,

COPY "of INTERMEDIATE REPORT of Dr. *Angus Smith*, Chief Inspector under the ALKALI ACTS, 1863 and 1874, to the Local Government Board, of his Proceedings since the passing of the latter ACT."

Local Government Board, 5 April 1876.

JOHN LAMBERT, Secretary.

INTERMEDIATE REPORT by Dr. *Angus Smith*, Chief Inspector under the ALKALI ACTS, 1863 and 1874, to the Local Government Board, of his Proceedings since the passing of the latter Act.

My Lords and Gentlemen, 9 November 1875.

IT is my wish in this short Intermediate Report to speak from my own experience, as well as that of my colleagues, of the work done under the New Alkali Act. I do so more readily from the fact that an attack has been made on the working of the Act at a time when it was being most energetically pushed forward. I am sorry that any should say, in the very midst of our most anxious work, that it is not finished. Still they say rightly; it is not done, but it is begun and well begun, and advanced to such an extent as the most influential and best informed of the manufacturers declared to be impossible before the passing of the Act, and still consider impossible as an enduring state.

It has been said that more gas was now escaping from the works than before. I know this to be impossible. Additional works are put under inspection, and sending off little gas; at other works there is less escape than usual. One of the most experienced of the alkali makers gives an account of his expenses for repairs; they are certainly twice as much as under the old Act, and are a very serious amount (*see* Appendix). Another, in order to bring his work under the new Act, is obliged to condense down to one per cent., and with such facts in great abundance, I know that less gas is escaping. It seems also to be forgotten that I have always, and long ago, advocated an extension of the Alkali Act, and a system of gradually increasing pressure, a mode of procedure which I still believe to be the only one promising any success. We know exactly what is wanted, but invention is gradual, and often expensive. 37 & 38 Vict. c. 43. 26 & 27 Vict. c. 124, s. 4.

I may now review the condition, the success, and the difficulties. The only definite clause in the Act is that demanding that the amount of muriatic acid should be not more than one-fifth of a grain per cubic foot of the escaping gases. This result has been obtained, and the escape from every alkali maker's chimney in the kingdom has been reduced, if reduction was necessary, to the amount required. A great difficulty therefore has been overcome, and one that threatened for a time to cause a collision with the manufacturers, which would have been a very great injury to the cause of inspection as a mode of protecting the public.

Irregularities.—But then it must be added, that when the reduction has been made it is not always continuous; the same process conducted in apparently the same way and in the same furnaces does not produce the same result; and in the west of England, as well as in Scotland and Ireland, where the close furnace is used, the cause of this is the same, namely, the frequent rents in the arch of the furnace causing a difficulty never yet overcome. It has not been found possible to make an arch which will resist the influence of heat and occasional cooling without cracking. The result of this is that the acid gas passes into the smoke flue, or rather we may say the fire which envelopes the furnace, and the gas is therefore taken to the chimney. The evil seems ridiculously small, but it is one which causes the chief trouble to manufacturers, inspectors,

and the public. The new Act has caused a great determination among several of the alkali makers to overcome the difficulties, and trials have been made, as yet not with full success.

One method is to cause a pressure on the fire flue, so that there may be an inclination for the gases of combustion to pass into the furnace containing the acid gases, instead of the contrary. This has been tried with steam, not successfully as yet, but the trials are not over.

An attempt has been made to do so by using gas for combustion instead of coal, and having the entrance of the gas several feet below the portion where the flame heats the arch, thus causing a pressure upwards; this, as mentioned in my last report, is successful. Gas, however, is not admired by all the manufacturers, and the universal introduction of this plan is hopeless. The same principle, however, is being tried in another way, and a good result is expected.

It was attempted also to cause a pressure of the coal gases by putting a difficulty in their passage after they had left the fire, and to some extent, but not to a full extent, this answered.

Instead of causing pressure of the fire gases, it seemed better to draw out the acid gases, and I expected a jet of steam to do this, and it did so perfectly; but an objection occurred here also, because more air was drawn through the furnace and carried hot onwards to the condensers, heating them too much. This, so far, has also been a failure.

The exertions made in the direction of solving this problem constitute of themselves a success, because it is pleasant to see the earnest desire to have the work well done, even if it does not produce all the end desired.

Refinement of Work.—The condensers for close furnaces do their work remarkably well, sometimes quite to perfection, and they may be easily made perfect by an addition of a small washer, which may without expense have lime put into it. In cases of slight escape, the amount of lime would be very trifling, and I do not see why all cases should not be like this.

These remarks do not apply to open furnaces such as are used at Newcastle. There the liability to accident is not so great, and if there is not sufficient condensation it is simply from want of refinement of work. Condensers are expensive, and one or two extra ones are wanted in most places, to enable the work to be done without continual anxiety to all concerned.

A great improvement has taken place there, but it is not yet, I am told, such as to satisfy. I shall be glad if I can induce some one to begin a lime system. It is said that the increase of condensers spoils the draught; it is so, and so I proposed a slight mechanical aid to the draught before the gas enters the chimney. If this aid were accompanied by a constant washing of lime, or even of chalk-and-water, probably the last trace of gases would be retained.

I have not until last year ventured on such a suggestion, and I am sure that some persons will think that I am going too far, but I am persuaded that the time is come when this is possible in some works without an unreasonable cost. It is by no means a new idea; it has entered, probably, many minds, and I have only hesitated because it is unfair or unwise to urge too far on the one side, or to lead to too high expectation on the other; and without some hope of success, it would be better not inserted in a report such as this; still it must be remembered this is going beyond the Act, and needs a trial.

Inspection by the Manufacturers.—When the Alkali Act was introduced, few of the alkali makers had good laboratories, still fewer had chemists sufficiently free to test the gases for themselves, and I may almost say that few had chemists fit to do so. Now things are entirely changed, and the frequent entrance of the inspector has caused him to be watched, imitated, or criticised, and nothing is commoner than a comparison of results with him. In some cases, and these increasing ones, the works are tested daily; and Mr. Todd informs me that this plan is introduced almost universally on the Tyne, or at least it was so for a while, and I hope they are not becoming weary of it. In some cases, and these increasing, the escape book is kept as regularly as the ledger, and the chemist opens it to the inspector, and shows the work done by him on this subject since the last visit. If the result on the day of visit agrees with the result obtained by the inspector, it speaks well for the previous days.

This is a great change, and one which never could have been brought about without inspection, one also furthered especially by the late Act, because it rendered inspection simpler and gave more confidence.

Sulphur Acids.—As to sulphur acids, a good deal has been done; this is dwelt upon chiefly in Dr. Hobson's report, and in this case the gain to the more careless manufacturers is not small. Mr. Fletcher considers this escape small in his district, but the works are very large, and a small escape from each is really an amount large enough to do evil. I believe it an easy thing to diminish it to nothing, and at present I see no reason why the last traces of this and muriatic acid should not be washed with lime-water whenever the outlets of the latter acid are fully under control. The nitrous gases used in the manufacture of sulphuric acid are treated at the same time.

Chlorine.—For this escape nothing novel has been done of consequence, *i.e.*, nothing in the changing of apparatus, but when the amount has been decided, attention has been called to it, and it has been stopped. The result has been that there is less bad apparatus in work than usual, and the methods of managing the chlorine chambers is being more studied. Still the gas is very subtle and difficult to manage, and it is also the cause of complaints which have often been referred to muriatic acid. This gas travels a great distance. It can be let off by the men readily and stopped readily, and the first act is sometimes said to be carried out in revenge.

Sulphuretted Hydrogen.—So far as sulphuretted hydrogen is concerned no definite directions are given under the Alkali Act, but the subject is a pressing one, and this gas is the real cause of some of the complaints made against acids. The advantages of dealing with this gas will probably be great; but it is only in some cases that individuals can act, and a proper combination is not yet effected.

The town of Widnes is very frequently, if not at all times, subjected to the influence of sulphuretted hydrogen. This arises not from anything that occurs in the numerous alkali works there, but from the waste products from these works. The tank waste, composed of sulphur and lime in various states of oxidation, is used for raising up the low lands on the Mersey, and forming a foundation for future buildings. The drainage of lands thus treated is offensive; it has a yellow colour, and on exposure to the air gives out the gas complained of. At certain spots the streams meet with acid streams, and the gas is then given out in enormous quantities. I have observed one spot, but I believe there must be others underground, perhaps also over-ground.

This evil cannot be dealt with by any one manufacturer, so far as I can see, without changes which might be inconvenient, but it could probably be dealt with by a combination of them.

Acid is continually flowing from the alkali works, as a consequence of the condensation, seeing that it is not allowed to flow into the air. This acid must find its way to the Mersey, and the streams from the tank waste must find their way also. The purification of the air from acid has therefore the effect of increasing the sulphuretted hydrogen, and this evil has greatly increased of late, and will probably increase with the great accumulations of the waste laid down. This extension of the waste must be a difficulty so long as the present mode of working lasts, and the accumulation must soon become so great, that the problem how to find room will be more and more difficult to solve.

This material gives out solutions which must long continue offensive, and the increase is continually extending the time required for purification, but by removing the sulphur partially by known methods the time must be greatly diminished, and the future protected.

The same material is causing offence in an extensive manner at St. Helens, and to a less degree in some other places. In Newcastle it is in most cases shipped out into the ocean and thrown overboard. It is impossible to find convenient room for it on land, and where it has been deposited it has been found inconvenient.

There are modes of extracting some of the sulphur from the waste at a profitable rate, but these are adopted by very few; the actual effect in diminishing the sulphur of the drainage water has not been fully ascertained, but it must be and is considerable.

There is also a mode of working so as to reduce the amount of lime used in the black ash furnace, and the result of this will probably be to allow much more sulphur to be removed profitably, but this also is not known with the fulness that is required. There is, however, hope that by these inventions the

inconvenience of putting tank waste on land may be very much diminished, and it may be considered how far the attention of alkali makers in their individual capacity, may be called to these points. A movement in this direction is expected to be of much value.

The evils are most striking at the spots where drainage lies exposed to the air and where acid meets it.

The first can surely be removed by surface drainage, thus reducing the area of liquid and of decomposition in that liquid.

The second is more difficult but requires attention. If a separate drainage were possible for the acid and alkaline solutions, the result would be that they would meet in the Mersey, and even there they would be somewhat offensive, at least so it seems to me, broad as it is; but that is a point which I cannot prove; the evil, however, would certainly be much diminished.

If the waste and sulphur-holding solutions were collected separately, and the sulphur extracted, there is the prospect of a profit instead of a loss, and towards this a great deal might be done by a proper arrangement of the material, so as to collect the drainage. Whether a combination of manufacturers or any other body would be fitted best for this, I do not attempt to say.

If the acid solutions were collected separately, and no trace allowed to go into the drainage, then there would be less escape of sulphuretted hydrogen at any spot, but the escape would occur over a more extensive region, partly of the Mersey. This is a condition we can scarcely expect.

It might be supposed that each manufacturer could deal with the waste of his own works, so as to extract some of the sulphur; but even if this were advantageous (and it is not impossible that want of space may create a difficulty there), there would still remain waste to be deposited somewhere, and to cause some nuisance, which would, however, be less than at present, and would not continue so long.

This independent action would not effect all that is required at present at Widnes, where the deposits of the various works are mixed, and in most cases inseparably so, and the conditions lead to the suggestion that the community, that is the Board of Health at the place, should consider the subject and make some attempt to seek a remedy, which calls for rapid action. The governing body at St. Helen's seems to have naturally a similar duty pressing upon it.

The complaints made by shipbuilders on the Tyne, alleging that the paint is spoilt by the gases, has been confirmed by the examination of a specimen sent me; the discolouration was caused by sulphuretted hydrogen, and not by muriatic acid.

Pressure under the New Act.—As a proof that I am giving the opinion of distinguished manufacturers, when I say that the minimum of escape in the late Act was considered by them too low to be attainable, I insert a letter from Mr. Gamble, of St. Helen's, one of those selected to watch the Bill in Parliament. I might insert more evidence on this point, but this is enough.

"15 October 1875.

"We are in receipt of your letter of the 7th.

"We test our chimney at least twice every day, and the tests we obtained on the day of Mr. Fletcher's visit were not nearly so high as he made the escape, and the 41 tests made since that visit down to the present time show an average of 0·18 gr. per cubic foot; but among these are some bad tests, which made us take a great deal of trouble in examining our furnaces, and put three entirely out for more careful examination and repair. But that we should run so close on the average to the limit fixed by the Act, with all the care we take, and when we have never been able to detect white smoke from the chimney, makes us very uncomfortable, and confirms what the writer told you before the passing of the last Act of the extreme difficulty there would be in complying with the limit of one-fifth of a grain, especially in such cases as ours, where the chimney is not used for soda furnaces or other large sources of draught, unless recourse is had to artificial dilution of the chimney gases, which is a course we are very unwilling to adopt.

(signed) "*C. Gamble & Sons.*"

In this condition of things it is well that landowners should not only be careful to be correct in their observations, but should know the difficulties with which they have to deal. If I know them better, it is because they have been my special study.

More prosecutions have been demanded. I have always said that prosecutions, if required, would increase in time, but first it was necessary that men should learn. I have done something better than mere fining. Let us take a late occurrence at Newcastle. An alkali maker, who was told that he had not condensing

densing power sufficient, is not only building new condensers, but he has had a new manager at a higher salary, and believed specially to understand condensation, and he has besides diminished his amount of manufacture in order to be within the Act. All these items are a serious expense, and at a time when trade is bad it is an open question with some whether it would not be better to stop altogether. These changes have been in the case alluded to a severe fine, and others have spent even more than he has. One manufacturer says that he has spent in changes caused by the new Act as much as 5*s*. per ton on the alkali made, an outlay which must appear very great to those who know the business. I do not know a more severe mode of fining or one that can be equally advantageous to the community. At other works, I am told that it was the additional strictness of the new Act which caused an entire stoppage.

This new Act has enabled us to have a change carried out that has long been much desired, and already alluded to; and in some works the analyses are made every day, in others twice a day, by the chemists employed there.

The new mode of examining has a simplicity which pleases everyone, and the objections anticipated have not occurred. Mr. Todd has had several openings made in some chimneys, so that an average of every spot can be taken readily.

The numbers returned for the Tyne have been always small, and although logically correct, I prefer the method now introduced.

It was really the case that in some works there was an uncertainty under the old Act, and the results in several cases on the Tyne were difficult to prove by the method adopted. At the same time the old one must not be forgotten, although for a while it has been less attended to, because the new one was more pressing and doing more good; both are now growing into one, so to speak.

At first it appears as if the treatment of every work were the same by the new Act. It is not entirely so, because some must condense to one per cent. in order to limit the amount per cubic foot to one-fifth of a grain, others do not require this, but the public gains the benefit, and cares little about per-centage so long as the air is pure.

The introduction of per-centage was an experiment never expected to succeed, and partly for that reason not opposed by the manufacturers, as I have been informed.

I must mention specially one case of difficulty. The owners of one of the largest works in the kingdom desired to see me, and when I called, the very serious communication was made, that after the most careful trials it was believed that it was impossible to comply with the requirements of the new Act. What was to be done in a case like this? was I to attempt to stop such a large work on which the living of, I suppose, some thousands of individuals depended, counting the workmen with their families, and all the varied connections which such a large manufacture must have? The answer to myself was simply this, certainly not at present. The next question was: If these are allowed to go on, how can others be consistently required to stop? This was a cause of great anxiety. It was a threatened dead lock or a failure of the Act, and it was one which I could not explain to the public, because it would be confessing a failure prematurely, and I had the fullest belief that time would remove the obstruction. All I could do therefore was to advise more attempts, and to be as reasonable as possible. The same quality of pressure was extended to all who were similarly desirous of doing their best. Encouraged by the reasonable delay, the owners, who certainly acted in a most straightforward manner, set again to work; they made many trials, and many changes, and kept two chemists continually testing their numerous furnaces and reporting the rate of progress. I am happy to say that every few weeks brought an improvement, and the escape has been reduced to such an extent, that as the exertions are continuing, I expect it soon to be much less than the maximum allowed.

In carrying out an Act of this kind we must expect a struggle. If it were a mere order to shut an office at five o'clock instead of six, it might be done as an act of obedience at once, but when the work must be carried on under new conditions, these must be studied, and the study is severe as well as expensive, deranging also much of the usual routine.

Of course, it may be asked, when all is done, is it enough?

Complaints on the Mersey and at Little Woolton, and on the Tyne.

Mr. Fletcher has collected the opinions of several persons well qualified, as we may suppose from their occupations to judge, and these are favourable, quite

agreeing that an improvement has taken place this year in the vegetation. The letter from Eccleston, near St. Helens, is very decided, and confirms an announcement in a former report, that fresh and healthy as well as clean leaves had been obtained from a spot which even 12 years ago appeared doomed to destruction.

At Widnes we know that less gas has escaped, and if this is not a benefit, the Acts may cease. It may be said that the works increase more rapidly than the improvements in condensation. That the greater amount of gas found at Little Woolton was caused by the remarkable continuation of east winds, agrees with that which was said regarding Gateshead, and is a most probable cause, but that the wind was the cause of the improvements observed this year near St. Helens, and in some other places, cannot be believed, as the principal spots are to the west where more than usual effects ought to have been found.

It must not be forgotten, too, that the improvements exist notwithstanding that copper works on the usual smelting system, burning off a great amount of sulphur, still are found at St. Helens, with glass works and potteries.

In Newcastle it was asserted that the increase of escape was very great. The resident inspector, Mr. Todd, was much annoyed at the complaints, the assertions being opposed to his experience, and he sent to ask Dr. Blatherwick to help him. He also sent to me urging an inquiry. I spent some time there, and it is most gratifying to learn that in every instance the report of Mr. Todd was confirmed as to the amount escaping.

37 & 38 Vict. c. 43, s. 4.

Dr. Blatherwick found even less gas than was reported to him. Less than one-tenth of a grain, or actually one-half the amount allowed, was found escaping from works which, from private information given, were considered as specially offensive.

See section 5.

This inquiry was confined to muriatic acid, and I had given instructions that this should be the first part of the Act which should be put in perfect working order, as it was best understood and the definitions relating to it were precise, whilst it was not so with the others. The rest of the Act being indefinite must gradually be worked up to a more distinct form, and that can be done only by experience. That it has more than begun will be also shown.

One of these most persistent complaints is from the owner of a most noxious chimney which does not come under the Act.

When I was leaving Newcastle a petition came to Mr. Todd signed by several hundred workmen of the Hebburn Colliery. Typhoid fever had broken out, and although the gases were not altogether blamed for it, it was believed that they might have done harm. The complaint was against one of the newly included copper works; Mr. Todd says that the complaint was chiefly against the chimney of the smelting furnace not under control. Dr. Spear, officer of health in South Shields, was good enough to examine the matter with him. He says, "from what we heard, I considered that the escape of gas was partly from the chimney of the smelting furnaces, and partly from the body of the works, that is, that gas sometimes escaped that never reached the condenser. Since we were there the miners say the escapes are greater at night or early morning. I don't know if this is likely to be so; I believe, however, they all admit that the escapes are less than they used to be."

I am glad to find that he confirms my opinion also in the following: "I cannot imagine that acid gas can have anything to do with the prevalence of fever; although of course it is possible, as Dr. Angus Smith says in one of his reports, that they lower the general health and so become a predisposing cause" (may become, would be nearer my opinion). "On the other hand, I am quite sure that the gases in the diluted state in which they are breathed in the works do not act as preservatory agents against fever, for fever is, to say the least, quite as prevalent in the near neighbourhood of the works as in any other part of the district, and lately I have met several instances where the labourers themselves have suffered from typhoid fever."

In my last report I showed that the gases did not prevent scarlet fever. I expected that the result might be different with sulphuretted hydrogen, but Dr. Spear has not found this.

At any rate the result of this inquiry is that the (acid) gases given out are acknowledged to be less, and even if not less, they cannot have caused the recent increase of typhoid fever.

But still I must ask what was the cause of the complaints being increased at Gateshead and Woolton, when of a certainty less gas was escaping. The peculiarity of the weather was one certain cause, and changes taking place in the works may

may have been another, but the main result remains: people demand more than the Acts give. One very certain cause is the increase of the drainage from waste heaps, and for this reason I wish combined action to attack this source of complaint.

The chimney giving out a very large amount of sulphuric acid near Gateshead, has been put out of use, and Glover's Towers are doing the work which caused the escape, and was a great cause of complaint, although not a new one.

It sometimes happens, however, that the cure of one evil produces another; and I am not quite sure that some such cause may have existed. There are always many points to attend to.

The accounts from the neighbourhood of the Tyne are not satisfactory, however, and some of the improvements spoken of in this report must be resorted to before they can be made so; and it is hoped that some steps will be taken voluntarily far beyond any of the demands of the Acts. I suppose legislation may follow as rapidly as invention will permit it.

I am inclined to believe in some great escapes at particular times; and on this point I may say that escapes at irregular times are not under the control of the inspectors. Even an inspector at every work could scarcely prevent this if the men were not fully under control. It has been said, but it must be repeated, that inspection can only take care of the general condition of a work, can see that the apparatus is suited for the requirements, and can see that, as a rule, the whole is well conducted. Accidents must be left to the observation of those who are in the neighbourhood.

It may, however, be true also, as has been said to me, that more inspection is required. Thinking it possible that some assistance was necessary, or would at least be useful to Mr. Todd, I offered to send him this for a short time as a trial at my own expense; but he had a desire to finish the work himself, and to reduce all the escapes to the standard of the new Act first; leaving the matter to be re-considered. It may, however, be true that some annoyance may have occurred at Gateshead which it is not in my power to find the cause of.

There can be little doubt that increased power of inspection might hurry on the changes, and enable us to keep those already made in a state of more constant efficiency. On this point I shall communicate more fully. But my object here is partly to show that not only are changes of great benefit everywhere going on, but on the Tyne during this summer, Mr. Todd's results were found decidedly correct; and so far as one acid was concerned, better results were obtained than most persons who knew the subject, expected. But the public wishes still more, and this I hope will be given; but whether they can obtain as much as they desire, is a very different thing.

Appended to this, I send the reports of my colleagues, each taking his own view, after simply consulting with me as to the points which would be worth bringing forward. The actual additional cost is not given so fully as I wished it, but it is difficult to calculate; when a furnace is stopt a loss occurs, and this stoppage by the inspectors is so frequent that it is not considered worth while to mention every case. At one work I was informed that 2,500 *l.* had been spent on changes, but even this would not be a full calculation. Mr. Fletcher gives only one case in detail, but it is a striking one; it is from Widnes, but he might have mentioned from the same district, furnaces entirely given up. Dr. Blatherwick gave a list of expenses, but as he held it to be very incomplete, it is not printed.

All my colleagues are convinced that the new Act has wrought much change, besides promising more, as it is a progressive one; however, so far as muriatic acid is concerned, Dr. Hobson seems to rejoice in the fact that in his district the new Act did not call on him to make any improvement. The work had been already done, probably because his district was more easily managed than the others.

Chemical Works not under Inspection.—As inspectors of alkali works, I and my colleagues have a continual excuse that other works and not those under their examination are the really guilty. It is sometimes true.

Since I left Newcastle I received a letter from the mayor, which may weigh against the complaint from Gateshead. He is quite right in calling attention to chemical works not under inspection, and I believe as little time as possible ought to be lost in making plans regarding them. I was glad, however, that a part only was done last year as we have had enough to consider. The mayor, Mr. Addison Potter, writes—

"I have pleasure in testifying to the great improvement here since the new Alkali Act has come into operation. My trees have suffered very little this year. I advised Mr. Todd

to do his spiriting gently, and as long as the alkali makers were endeavouring to bring their works to his requirements, to extend the time as much as possible; and I consider that great credit is due him for the judicious manner in which he has brought all the manufacturers of the Act with almost no grumbling on their part; but I hope that you will still continue your endeavours to purify the atmosphere and bring in a Bill to put all fumes under the same control.

"The chimney from Landgale's Manure Works is a perfect nuisance; the smell is sickening and Mr. Todd has no power to interfere.

"This should not be.

"Yours, &c.

"(signed) *Addison Potter.*"

Having shown the present position of the work, occasion may be taken to say that the late Act is expansible and can be carried out much further than it yet is, but the public mind hurries forward, and considering its demands I am inclined to think it would be well early to include the remaining chemical works in a supplementary Bill as previously proposed by me.

The mode of introducing the other works must, I suppose, be in a manner allied to the indefinite clauses of the Act of 1874, and I should propose, exactly as I did on a previous occasion, that all chemical works or works giving out offensive gases, such as acids sulphuric, sulphurous, muriatic, or nitric, nitrous gases, sulphuretted hydrogen, chlorine, or offensive compounds of any of these gases or of fluorine should, on complaint being made, be put for a certain time under inspection. This prevents the demand, at least for the time, of a great number of inspectors.

It seems also perfectly clear that chemical works will never be carried on in such a way as to be entirely inoffensive in all cases; it is therefore requisite to provide for the results of the offence and to put in order the process of claims for damages. This, I think, can be done by a clause to this effect: that if damage is proved to be done by fumes from any chemical work, the amount to be paid shall be in proportion to the amount of gases given out by the works and capable of causing more or less of the injury, taking also other proved conditions into consideration.

This will prevent any attempt to shelter one work at the expense of others, a frequent cause of gross injustice; the method in which contradictory evidence is used at trials of such cases has produced a considerable want of confidence in the results.

I have, &c.

(signed) *R. Angus Smith.*

REPORT.—DISTRICT No. 1.

November 1875.

In reporting on the working of the Alkali Act of 1874 it is desirable to represent the experience of the agriculturists on the one hand and that of the manufacturers on the other hand respecting it.

With regard to the farmers, it is not easy to obtain any clear expression of opinion, except when that takes the form of complaint. When damage is done to the crops complaints come clearly, and it is right they should, but no one is at the trouble of speaking merely to say that no damage has been done or to say that less has been done than usual. Complaints have, however, been much less frequent on the part of farmers and landowners this year than formerly, and in reply to my inquiries the silence has been broken in a few cases, so that I am able to quote letters received relating to the amount of damage lately done.

One is from Mr. Broomfield, the forester on Lord Derby's estate at Knowsley, which is exposed to injury from the smoke of St. Helens.

He says . . . "Respecting the damage done to trees by the smoke from the different works in St. Helens, I consider the woods and young plantations are looking better the past 12 months than they have done since I have been at Knowsley, which is nearly 16 years."

Mr. Hale, writing also from Knowsley, says, "I do not see any increase in the amount of damage done. Considering the increase of the manufactures this may be something gained."

Mr. Hale goes on to complain grievously of a particular smell that still reaches them, but as he describes it as something that forms a scum on the surface of water he proves it not to be acid, and so takes it out of all comparison with past years.

I cannot

I cannot refrain from here saying that I believe all the woods on the St. Helens side of Knowsley Park would before this have been swept away had it not been for the protection afforded them by the Alkali Acts, and in this opinion I believe I am supported by most people who know the district.

Mr. Taylor, who owns a large estate between St. Helens and Knowsley, appears to be of this opinion, for he writes, "as soon as inspection was in force, after the passing of Lord Derby's Noxious Vapours Act, the improvement was most marked as regards my father's estate. The damage to the foliage of the young timber and the coppice was nothing in comparison to what it had been. What is left of the old timber is ruined past recovery." He remarks on the damage done by works other than Alkali Works, and expresses a wish that further legislation should be attempted.

Wishing to know the opinion of the farmers who are the most exposed to the smoke of Widnes, I wrote to several; only two replied. Mr. Isaac Prescot, who has a farm at Tarbock and also one at Bold, is exposed to smoke both from Widnes and from St. Helens; he writes, "I find little or no damage done this summer to what I have other summers."

Messrs. Wm. and T. Taylor, who hold a large farm in Cuerdley within two miles of Widnes, write, "There has been less damage done to crops and trees this year than usual, which we suppose is owing to the amended Alkali Act."

I called on the farmers who had not replied to my letters. They all said that vegetation had been better this year than usual; some had had an abundant crop of apples, while of late there had been none.

From these statements and from my own observation I believe there has been some improvement in the condition of the country this year, that is to say, that during the past 11 years we have limited the area of damage and kept the evils from increasing, but that during this year we have been able to diminish the injured area.

With regard to the manufactures, one may speak more exactly.

The opportunity which the new Act gives of estimating the amount of hydrochloric acid at so much per cubic foot of effluent gases in place of so much per cent. of the quantity made in the works, has in many cases been the means of greatly reducing the amount of acid sent away into the air.

This diminution has not been made easily, but has entailed very great expense on the manufacturers, both in the erection of increased condensing apparatus and in keeping the furnaces in which the acid is generated in a more perfect state of repair. One of the manufacturers states that he has spent 959 *l.* extra on repairs, and he adds, "We get very much less work from our plant even at an enormously extra expense for repairs;" he gives the following figures:—

Cost of Extra Condensers.

		£.	s.	d.
Alkali Department	6 months ending 31st December 1874 -	525	5	5
	„ 30th June 1875 - -	588	8	4
Copper Department	„ „ - -	275	–	–
	£.	1,388	13	9

Repairs for Six Months ending—			
30th June 1874, 6,400 tons sulph. soda. made - - -	1,683	–	–
31st December 1874, 6,700 „ „ - - - -	1,621	–	–
30th June 1875, 5,050 „ „ - - - -	2,580	–	–

From this it appears that under the new Alkali Act the amount spent on repairs per ton of material made is double of what it was under the old Act.

The diminished amount of material manufactured is owing to the constant stopping of furnaces, when a little acid gas is found to be leaking through the brickwork: such frequent stopping was not necessary in order to comply with the old Act; the manufacturer would not incur more than one-tenth of this expense were it not for the compulsion of the Acts.

I have made an estimate of the cost of the condensing apparatus now at work. I think in Widnes it amounts to 90,000 *l.*, and that in the whole of my district there is now to be seen that whichhas cost 200,000 *l.*

The copper extracting works (by the new process) are now brought under the Act. To comply with it condensers have been built, furnaces and flues repaired or re-constructed. One of the copper works has 28 furnaces; each of these has been in measure rebuilt; some of them wholly so. Also a chemist has been engaged, and is now constantly employed in testing the effluent gases, so as to keep within the Act.

With regard to the pressure of the new Act, I think the line drawn is quite as close as the manufacturers can bear, and that to keep within it requires their most constant and watchful effort, and a largely increased expenditure.

In conclusion perhaps a word may be said regarding the increased labour the new Act has put upon the inspectors. In most of the works increased condensing apparatus presents more numerous points where chemical tests must be applied in order to complete inspection. In some of the works the labour has thus been increased fourfold. Throughout my district the work has been fully doubled. New methods of examination have also to be devised in order to meet the altered circumstances.

(signed) *Alfred E. Fletcher.*

Dr. R. Angus Smith, F.R.S., &c.,
Manchester.

THE following note has since been added:

The principal results obtained under the new Alkali Act have been due to the working of Clause 4, which limits the amount of HCl escaping to $\frac{1}{10}$th grain per cubic foot of air or smoke. Although the Act is not more stringent as to the total amount sent out, namely, 5 per cent., yet owing to the mode of carrying on many of the works in this district, this limit to the amount of acid per cubic foot has, in fact, very much diminished the total amount, and this too in the case of those works which probably did the most harm. When the figures are published showing the average amount of HCl escaping from the various works during last year, a diminution, as compared with previous years, will be apparent; but this will not be final; there will be a progressive diminution, for it has taken some time for the manufacturers to realise and meet the pressure put upon them. For instance, it is found that the form of roasting furnace commonly used throughout this district gives rise often to a breach of the new Act. I have felt it to be my duty unceasingly to point this out, because I believe that the escape of HCl will be materially diminished when these furnaces are better constructed.

In the district there are about 140 of them. I trust it will not be long before I can report that they have been superseded by an improved form. Many experiments are on foot for this end, and much success has been achieved, but it will be seen that all the furnaces in use in a particular trade cannot be replaced suddenly. The want of a better furnace has been felt chiefly under the new Act.

In the meantime the provisions of the Act are observed, but at a very great cost to many of the manufacturers; with the present appliances it is very difficult for some of them to keep down the amount of escaping HCl to $\frac{1}{10}$th grain per foot of smoke. This increased cost is the lever that will move the furnaces.

The clause next in importance, as measured by its effect here, is I think No. 3. Under this clause the copper extracting works are ranked as alkali works, since they emit HCl by the decomposition of common salt, as do the alkali works proper. There are seven of them in this district, and I found on inspecting them that fully as much HCl was sent away as was feared. In all cases, however, apparatus has been put up to condense the acid, and the amount of escape has been brought within the limits of the Act. A considerable capital has been expended to effect this. In these works difficulties are met with not found in the alkali works, difficulties which some despaired of overcoming. Necessity has, however, in these cases had its usual offspring, and the desired methods have been invented for accomplishing the objects in view.

11 January 1876. (signed) *Alfred E. Fletcher.*

REPORT.—DISTRICT, No. 2.

Dear Sir, Eccles, 4 November 1875.

The new Act has not caused very much alteration in my district as far as the muriatic acid is concerned, as most of the works are small and do not decompose much salt, so that a quantity any way approaching $\frac{1}{3}$th of a grain per cubic foot in the chimney amounted to more than the 5 per cent. allowed by the old Act. At most of the works the escape has been considerably below 5 per cent., and consequently the amount in the chimney much less than the $\frac{1}{3}$th of a grain permitted by the new Act. In some works, however, and especially the larger ones, additional condensers and flue wash-towers have been erected, and in all cases more care is taken in the working.

The following numbers, the result of my examination in September, will show that the works generally are in an efficient state: average quantity of muriatic acid per cubic foot in the chimney, 0·10 gr.; escape, 2·22 per cent.

I have had to alter my method of testing; previously I tried in the flues, now in the chimney; the results are somewhat the same.

As for the sulphuric acid manufacture, alterations have been made in nearly every work; in some new, and others additional, Glover and Gay Lussac towers, and extra chambers have been erected at great cost, and in a great many the chambers, being slightly leaky, have been rebuilt. These alterations have undoubtedly reduced the escape of acid gas to a great extent. I give as a proof of this some experiments I made at Messrs. Farmer & Sons, on four different days. I found the escape from the chambers as follows:

Grains of Acid per Cubic Foot.	Lbs. of Acid per Hour.	Per Cent.
24·74	19·792	10·15
11·77	9·416	4·83
6·00	4·800	2·46
15·10	12·080	6·20

In consequence of the new Act, and at my suggestion, an extra or condense chamber was built. An experiment made since gave me—

Grains of Acid per Cubic Foot.	Lbs. of Acid per Hour.	Per Cent.
0·85	0·680	0·35

These numbers speak for themselves. If this result has been obtained in one case, and that a small work, may we not expect very great improvement from the extensive alterations that have been and are now being made in the works generally.

I find, in consequence of the new Act, that two, three, and sometimes more tests have to be made when one was sufficient before, and also that the work in my laboratory is very considerably increased. Three new works come under inspection, and experiments have become necessary in several others that previously required superficial examination only.

The new Act throws very much greater responsibility upon us, a responsibility not in name only, as I feel certain, from a number of experiments, that more damage has been recently done in my district from the escape of sulphuric acid than that of muriatic acid.

My opinion is formed from upwards of 30 experiments made on chambers before alterations were made to meet the requirements of the new Act. I found that from 30 works during one hour there were 950 lbs. of sulphuric acid passing away, while from the same works and during the same time 245 lbs. only of muriatic acid was escaping. Moreover, the escape of sulphuric acid is much more liable to vary than that of muriatic acid, and will consequently require more careful watching.

I am, &c.

Dr. R. Angus Smith. (signed) *John T. Hobson.*

The following has since been added:—

Very few complaints have been made of the works in my district during the past year; in fact, I can only at the present moment call to mind three, all of them of an insignificant character. The first, Bury & Co., was certainly due to the accidental breaking of two concentrating glasses containing sulphuric acid. This would cause a great nuisance, but for a very short time only. The

second, Tennants & Co., Manchester: this work is situated in a town surrounded by shops and dwelling-houses, and it is scarcely surprising that occasionally, the people being in such very close proximity, there may have been a little annoyance. I have repeatedly visited the works, and expect that, after adopting a suggestion I made to them, one cause of nuisance will cease. The third, Dentith, is also close to a town. This work originally was under the Alkali Act; but as they have ceased making muriatic acid it does not, strictly speaking, now come under my inspection. The owner, however, being anxious not to annoy his neighbours, wishes me to consider it an alkali work. It is only a very small place, and little work done at it. A great improvement has taken place during last year, and a further one is promised immediately.

There are two works about which frequent complaints were made formerly, but of which none whatever were made last year. Firstly, Chance Brothers & Co.: the improvement here is mainly due to the erection of new condensers. Secondly, Barton & Co.: at this work the sulphuric acid chambers were in bad order, but are now entirely renewed.

As I mentioned before, nearly all the works in my district, previous to the passing of the 1874 Act, sent out much less than $\frac{1}{5}$th of a grain per cubic foot; it was necessary for them to do this, to conform to the 1863 Act, so that most of the credit for the small number of complaints must be given to improvements on the sulphuric acid plant.

In almost every work the chambers have been renewed; and in many, additional chambers and towers have been erected. That there has been a very great improvement is an undoubted fact, and much may be expected from alterations not yet completed. I am not able at present to give figures to prove this, except in two cases.

It is admitted in one case that now four tons more vitriol are made per week from the same quantity of material than was done before.

Messrs. Howarth & Sons erected also a new chamber, burners and towers, and the result obtained here is also very satisfactory.

The chamber exit contained—

Before Improvements.	After Improvements.
Grains of Acid per Cubic Foot.	Grains of Acid per Cubic Foot.
16·71	1·36
8·00	1·76
11·75	0·52

These figures speak for themselves; and I expect in a short time to find that this great improvement is the rule, not the exception.

Three copper extracting works come under my inspection; in two of these no towers whatever were used until the passing of the Act. Now, of course, they have them, and are working satisfactorily. The third I found, although using condensers, was still sending out large quantities of acid.

Alterations have been made; and my last examination gave less than $\frac{1}{5}$th of a grain per cubic foot escaping. I must in conclusion say that my experience coincides with that of my colleagues in the complaints by the alkali makers, that their sulphuric acid plant is under inspection, and not that of their neighbours, who do not make alkali.

REPORT.—NEWCASTLE DISTRICT, No. 3.

The average quantity of HCl contained in the gases of combustion escaping up the different chimnies in my district is shown as follows in grains or parts of a grain per cubic foot:—

No. 5.—No alteration, the escape 0·13, 0·9, 0·12.

No. 51.—The water for the condensers has been better regulated, and sprays introduced at the bottom of all the roaster condensers.

The escape has been 0·3, 0·38
0·28
0·22
0·63

1·51 ÷ 4 = 0·38, 0·52
0·18

0·70 ÷ 2 = 0·35, 0·16, 0·11, 0·05, 0·105, 0·08, 0·10, 0·17, 0·2, and when tested by Dr. Blatherwick, on the 13th October, 0·0976, 0·109, 0·054.

No. 52—A large increase of the water used for condensing and sprays introduced at the bottom of the roaster condensers.
The escape has been 0·42, 1·5, 0·6, 0·16, 0·12, 0·09, 0·19.

No. 53.—Alterations making the escape 0·8, 0·16, ·14.

No. 54.—The escape 0·15.

No. 55.—New condensers have been built, but not yet regulated, and sprays introduced to the bottom of the roaster. The escape 0·3, ·23.

No. 56.—All the roaster condensers have been new packed, and one more condenser added; the water has also been better regulated.
The escape 0·54, 0·36, 0·3, 0·23, 0·24, 0·15, 0·12, 0·27, 0·29, 0·23, 0·2, 0·08, 0·06, and when tested by yourself, on the 15th October, 0·13.

No. 57.—New condensers have been built, and a spray cistern added to the condensers.
The escape 0·23, 0·2, 0·12, 0·12, 0·09.

No. 58.—New condensers lately put to work, and two spray cisterns added.
The escape 0·41, 0·54, 0·2, 0·15, 0·13.

No. 61.—The condensation has been improved by doubling the quantity of water used in the condensers.
The escape 0·27, 0·23, 0·5, 1·29, 0·5, 1·29, 3·7, 0·3, 0·1, 0·26, 0·05, 0·49, 0·17, 0·2, 0·19, 0·14, 0·29, 0·25, 0·7. 0·2, 0·1.

No. 63.—The condensers at these works are as large and in as good condition as any in this district. Sprays have been introduced in the bottom of the roaster condensers, and although the escape is under 1 per cent., yet they have not succeeded in so regulating the draught as to bring their escape in the chimney regularly below 0·2, but I expect they will accomplish this shortly. The escape has been 0·9, 0·54, 0·4, 0·28, and when tested by Dr. Blatherwick, on 13th October, 0·29, 0·18 small chimney.

No. 64.—These works were idle for some months, but since they have commenced to decompose, the water has been better regulated, and the escape reduced from 0·5 to 0·2.

No. 67.—No alteration, but the supply of water to the condensers better regulated.
The escape has been 0·25, 0·2, 0·2, 0·2, 0·3, 0·4, 0·1, 0·12, and when tested by Dr. Blatherwick, on the 13th October, 0·091.

No. 70.—No alterations. The escape 0·11, 0·15.

No. 71.—New condensers have been erected, and are in use. The escape 0·18, 0·12.

No. 114.—These works are now idle.

No. 59.—Not decomposing salt at present.

No. 60.—Not decomposing salt at present.

No. 107.—The water for condensation has been better regulated. Sprays have been introduced in the bottom of the roaster condensers.
The escape 0·57, 0·35, 0·12, pan 1·5, 0·12, pan 0·18, 0·11, pan 0·11, 0·13, 0·09.

No. 68.—Not decomposing salt.

No. 108.—The pan and roaster gases, which were carried together to one condenser, have been separated, each going to separate condensers. The escape, 4·5, 0·16, 0·16.

No. 116.—No alteration, but the water better regulated on the condensers. The escape 0·5, 0·3, 0·19, 0·02.

No. 122.—The condensation very regular, 0·09.

No. 132.—No alterations in condensers, but the water supply to them better regulated.
The escape 0·4, 0·12, 0·08, 0·09, 0·19, 0·2, 0·15, 0·12, 0·13, 0·09.

No. 142.—Wet copper process decomposing salt by sulphates.
The escape 0·15, 0·16, 0·12.

No. 143.—Wet copper process decomposing salt by sulphates.
The escape 23·6, 0·07, 0·1, 0·11, 0·1, 0·08.

No. 137.—Wet copper process decomposing salt by sulphates.
The escape 0·08, 0·12, 0·15.

No. 138.—Great alterations have been made here; the open roasters employed in decomposing salt by sulphates have been replaced by close roasters, with a pressure of gas between the roaster and arch of the furnace forming the flue over it, by which means the escape has been reduced from 0·7 to 0·15.

No. 115.—No alteration, except in the supply of water to the condensers. The escape, ·48, 0·3, 0·23, 0·15.

No. 101.—Here a new furnace for decomposing chlorides has been invented; instead of decomposing the salt partly in the pan, by putting all the SO_3 on it at once, and then turning it over to the roaster to be finished, the salt is put into a pan with a flat bottom resting on a solid bed, and a fire going over it with a sort of plough worked by machinery constantly moving round it and stirring up the charge; the acid is added by degrees, so that instead of having large volumes of HCl given off at one particular time of the charge, it is given off regularly during the whole charge; the sulphate when drawn is perfectly free from HCl and SO_3 so constantly given off by the old way of working. The escape 0·02, 0·16.

150.—The escape 0·08.

REPORT.—DISTRICT, No. 4.

My dear Sir, Glasgow, October 1875.

THERE can be no doubt as to the beneficial working of the new Act in Scotland and Ireland. The whole district is busy with additions and improvements; there is more general care shown in conducting the manufactures, and certainly more alertness in remedying evils. One of the most striking benefits of the new Act is the increased facility it affords in stopping a nuisance. Under the old per-centage clause relating to muriatic acid, there was some difficulty in establishing an offence, and frequently a difficulty in demonstrating the per-centage itself with accuracy; now, however, I have no hesitation in stopping a work, or such part of a work, that is at fault.

No doubt, with your concurrence, legal actions might have been raised in some cases, and indeed there are but few manufacturers who, at one time or other, could not have been summoned under the strict letter of the law; but I have preferred using vigilance in stopping evils and endeavouring to get the manufacturers to establish permanent improvements.

This pressure, properly exercised, will probably mature many new discoveries and expediencies which may become undoubted benefits to the public.

With regard to the other provisions of the new Act (those relating to sulphur and other gases), I was certainly surprised to find so large an escape. Either from carelessness or want of proper preventive means, much gas was allowed to pass away. The remedies in most cases were manifest, and are being adopted.

I must again mention that the "alkali makers" complain very strongly that the new Act does not include all vitriol makers. I have made inquiry about this, and find that in my district there are more "manure makers" manufacturing vitriol than alkali makers. Even these do not include all who make sulphuric acid or vitriol.

I can furnish you with the names of these firms, and the quantity of sulphur they burn. I shall also furnish you with full details of the facts hereafter mentioned in my annual report.

I have not taken into consideration here the losses entailed on the manufacturers by the repeated stoppage of furnaces. Pecuniarily they have suffered as much as if legal actions had been brought against them, but the public have gained.

The outlay throughout the district, in consequence of the new Act (for increase of plant, &c., &c.), is considerable, but not fully ascertained. Subjoined are a few details illustrating my remarks.

Yours, &c.
(signed) *Charles Blatherwick.*

Name, &c. of Work.	Alterations and Improvements under New Act.
106.—On several occasions the HCl escape has exceeded 0·2 grains per cubic foot.	Last testings = ·088 grains per cubic foot.
There has been great difficulty in keeping tight furnaces.	Furnaces reconstructed entirely, at considerable cost.
	Erection of another wash tower.
Very large escape of sulphur gases. On my first visit as much as 17 grains per cubic foot (estimated as $S O_3$).	Erection of wash tower for furnace gases.
This was at once stopped.	
For the last four or five months 20lbs. of sulphur has been taken off the hourly charge.	A saving of the burning of 25 tons of sulphur.
	Erection of water condenser.
The size of sulphurous acid exit is an 18-inch diameter pipe.	Erection of denitrating tower.
Speed 4 feet for 1 sec. - - - - - -	Last testings showed 2 grains per cubic foot sulphur at exit of condenser.
80.—Muriatic acid was at exit escape ·28 - - -	Last testing ·14 grains per cubic foot.
	Stoppage of furnace for five months.
A large escape of gases from vitriol chambers, 3 grains $S O_3$ per cubic foot.	Erection of large water, Gay Lussac, and Glover towers.
	Improved water supply to condensers.

Name, &c. of Work.	Alterations and Improvements under New Act.
79.—A very large work requiring much inspection, as all the uncondensed gases from 20 salt cake furnaces (close) pass undiluted through one chimney. There is great difficulty in lowering the escape below ·2, but taking the average per cent. of condensation, it is very good. Little or no escape from condensers - - Many experiments have been tried here to lessen escape. The introduction of a powerful blast of air to the furnance flues, and an attempt to condense the escaping acid gases by dry limestone, are still occupying the attention of the owners. The escape has been lessened and perpetual testing of flues and chimneys rigidly exacted.	Erection of large wash tower. Employment of two assistants to watch and test escapes of HCl. For the last six months (as compared with the corresponding six months of last year) there has been a saving of 15·6 per cent. of the amount previously lost, or 21 tons of HCl saved.
73.—HCl condensation was 97½ per cent., though at times more than ·2 grains per cubic foot was found in exit. There was a large escape of sulphur gases. Estimating them as SO_3, there was more than 4 grains escaping per cubic foot. Speed was about 5 feet per sec. and the dimension of exit pipe = 20 inches in diameter.	New furnace of improved construction. Erection of condenser to stop this waste; last testings = 0·6 grains per sec. cubic foot from the chambers, not the chimney.
134.—Escape of HCl was ·33 grains per cubic foot of chimney gases.	Escape now = ·12. Entire stoppage of one furnace.
105.—Escape of HCl = ·35 grains per cubic foot	Stoppage of half the work pending permanent improvements. Average of last escapes 0·18 grains.
83.—Condensation here 98 per cent. yet = 0·3 HCl has been found in chimney. All the uncondensed salt cake gases go through one stalk, undiluted except by the gases of the coal used for these furnaces.	Stoppage of furnace, and an attempt to condense the HCl. escaping with the furnace smoke. Employment of special analyst. Improvement in construction of furnaces. Last testings showed less than 0·2 grains.
135.—Escape of HCl nearly ·4 grains per cubic foot, or as much again as it should be. The owner was unwilling to believe this till I showed it to him in his own laboratory.	Stoppage of three furnaces pending improvements. Erection of large condenser. Stoppage of salt cake furnace. Last testings = 0·17 grains HCl. per cubic foot.
117.—There was a large escape of acid gases from the vitriol chambers, 4 grains per cubic foot through 20-inch diameter pipe. Speed 5 feet per sec.	Erection of large water tower. Erection of Gay Lussac towers, &c.
128.—HCl escape twice exceeded the ·2 grains per cubc foo t.	Erection of wash towers and extra tanks for condensing of HCl. Escape reduded to 0·085 grains per cubic foot.
95.—HCl occasionally over the ·2 grains - -	Erection of large new stone condensing tower. Re-constructing of furnaces; escape 0·12 per cubic foot.

ALKALI ACTS, 1863 AND 1874.

COPY of INTERMEDIATE REPORT of Dr. *Angus Smith*, Chief Inspector under the ALKALI ACTS, 1863 and 1874, to the Local Government Board, of his Proceedings since the passing of the latter ACT.

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed.*
7 *April* 1876.

165.

Under 2 *oz.*

REPORT

BY THE

Inspectors of Salmon Fisheries, on the Provisions of the 15th Section of the Salmon Fishery Act, 1873, relating to Elver Fishing on the Severn.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

SIR, Home Office, Whitehall, 20th June 1876.

WE have the honour to inform you that, in accordance with the instructions of Mr. Secretary Cross, we held an inquiry on Thursday and Friday, the 8th and 9th inst., at Gloucester, and on Saturday, the 10th inst., at Worcester, into the operation of the 15th section of the Salmon Fishery Act, 1873.

This section enacts that "no person between the 1st day of January and the 24th day "of June inclusive shall hang, fix, or use, in any salmon river, any baskets, nets, traps, "or devices for catching eels or the fry of eels, or place in any inland water any device "whatsoever, to catch or obstruct any fish descending the stream."

We are now in a position to make the following Report:—

The eel is a migratory fish, and abounds in the majority of our rivers, lakes, and ponds. Its history and habits are only imperfectly known, but the salient points of them may be stated as follows:—In the autumn months the adult eels, especially after rain, migrate to the estuaries of the rivers which they inhabit. While so migrating they are taken in bucks, traps, nets, and other engines, both in the river and at the mouths of tributaries and ditches connected with it. In the spring months, from February to June, and especially in March, April, and May, the elvers, or eel fry, migrate from the estuaries to the fresh waters. While so migrating they are captured in the lower portions of the Severn and other rivers by the neighbouring population, formed into cakes, and sold as food.

An adult eel weighs from $\frac{1}{8}$ of a lb. to 7 lbs., according to its age, and is known successively as a "stick eel," a "shuntling," and an eel. 1,400 to 1,500 elvers make 1 lb. As a cwt. of elvers are frequently taken in one night by one man, and hundreds of men are at the same time taking elvers in the Severn, some idea may be obtained of the prodigious number of elvers that annually enter that river.

Legislation affecting elvers applied, up to 1873, exclusively to the Severn. By an Act passed about 200 years ago, 30 Car. II. cap. 9., it was enacted that no one "shall use "any net, engine, instrument, or device for the taking of the fry of eels commonly called "elvers" in the river Severn. This Act, or rather this provision of this Act, seems, so far as we can trace, to have never been obeyed, and 100 years ago it underwent an important modification. The 18th Geo. III. c. 33. declares that whereas "elvers "(the brood of eels) which come up the river Severn at a certain season in immense "quantities, and afford a great support for the inhabitants of the adjacent parishes and "places, are now totally prohibited by law from being taken, be it enacted that so much "of the fore-mentioned Act (30 Car. II.) as relates to the penalty on persons who take "elvers to and for their own use only, and not for sale, shall be repealed."

The 30th Car. II. had therefore absolutely prohibited the capture of elvers in the Severn; the 18th Geo. III. permitted their capture for the fishermen's own use; but the 18th Geo. III. seems to have been no more observed than the 30th Car. II. Rudder published his history of Gloucestershire in the year which followed the passing of the later Act. He alludes to the importance of the elver fishing, but he seems to be in total ignorance of any legislative provisions affecting it. Yarrell in 1836 was equally ignorant of them, though he also alludes to the elver fishery at Gloucester. Nor were we able to find that a single prosecution for taking elvers had ever taken place under either of these Acts, or that a single person had at any time attended to their provisions respecting elvers.

[C.—1533.] *Price* $\frac{1}{2}d.$

The 30th Car. II. was repealed by the Salmon Fishery Act, 1861, and from that time till 1873 no legislation relative to elvers was probably in force. The 18th Geo. III. had only relaxed the provisions of the previous statute, and its provisions quâ elvers became probably inoperative when the statute which it had modified fell. If this view be correct, it follows that there was no legislation relating to elvers in force between 1861 and 1873. Nor did the Salmon Fishery Act, 1873, as it was originally drawn, provide any. The 15th section in its original shape was intended to prevent the placing of eel traps between the 1st January and the 24th June. During that portion of the year no eels are migrating down the rivers to the sea, but great numbers of salmon kelts and salmon smolts are passing down the rivers seawards. The placing of eel traps during these months is not necessary for the capture of eels, since the eels are not migrating downwards at the time, and cannot be taken in them. But their placing led to the destruction of large numbers of salmon kelts and smolts, and was therefore most injurious to the salmon fisheries. The section, then, in its original shape, was intended to promote the express object of the Salmon Acts—the cultivation of salmon. But the Act, in its passage through Parliament, was referred to a select committee. During its progress through the committee, the words "the fry of eels" were added to the section. This slight amendment changed the object and the scope of the clause. The Act, from being a purely Salmon Act, became also an Act for the preservation of the fry of eels.

There is nothing in the minutes of the committee to show why this amendment was made. But we have reason to believe that it was not approved either by Mr. Dillwyn, who introduced the bill, or by the chief promoters of the bill out of Parliament.

It will be seen that the provision which was thus introduced went much further than those contained in the Acts 30 Car. II., and 18 Geo. III. They had applied to the Severn alone; the provision in the Salmon Fishery Act, 1873, applied to every river in the country. Since 1873, however, no attempt appears to have been made to enforce the provision respecting elvers or any other river besides the Severn: the Conservators of the Severn have alone endeavoured to carry out the law. The proceedings which they have taken with this object do not appear to have led to any material diminution in the capture of elvers; but they have produced an agitation in the district amongst the elver takers, which has resulted in the present inquiry.

We can have no hesitation whatever in saying that the provisions of the law relating to elvers, so far as they affect other rivers than the Severn, should be at once repealed. No one wishes to retain them: no one desires to enforce them. From a correspondence which has been already presented to Parliament, it will be seen that the Conservators of the Usk have been placed in a difficult position from their reluctance, on the one hand, to enforce a law, which they consider would act most hardly on the poor and would be of no benefit to the Salmon Fisheries of the Usk, and from their desire, on the other hand, to avoid disregarding the trust which Parliament has confided to them. We consider that it is only just that they should be relieved from the dilemma, and that, for this reason alone, it is most desirable that the law relating to elvers should be unreservedly repealed.

We do not think it necessary, in recommending the repeal of the law, to enter at any great length into the question whether the preservation of elvers is necessary for the production of eels. We very much doubt whether there is any evidence to prove that the wholesale capture of elvers is more injurious to the eel fishery than the wholesale capture of whitebait is to the herring and sprat fisheries. We very much doubt therefore, whether it is in the least degree more necessary to prohibit generally the capture of elvers than the capture of whitebait. And as elvers are essentially a poor man's food, being sold for 1*d.* to 2*d.* per lb., and as whitebait are essentially a rich man's food, we think it is most undesirable to interfere, except upon grounds of the most proved necessity, with the capture of elvers.

Nor, if elvers are to be protected, is it clear that a salmon river is the proper place for their protection. It is indeed asserted that the elvers are the food of salmon kelts, and smolts, and that their presence is therefore beneficial to the salmon; but on the other hand, a good many authorities believe that eels are injurious to salmon fisheries. There are three species of eels in this country, the broad-nosed eel, the sharp-nosed eel, and the snig eel. There is some doubt whether the sharp-nosed eel preys to any great extent on other fish, but there is no doubt that the broad-nosed eel and the snig eel feed on fish and other animal food. Elvers are the fry of all these kinds of eels, and it is, to say the least, doubtful whether their excessive preservation in a salmon river is desirable.

So far, then, as every river except the Severn is concerned we have no hesitation in recommending that the provisions of the 15th section of the Salmon Fishery Act, 1873,

respecting elvers, should be repealed. But it still remains for consideration whether any legislation on the subject, and if so, what legislation, should be adopted on the Severn.

The Conservators of the Severn, on the one hand, do not desire to maintain the existing provisions of the law. They are willing to sanction the capture of elvers between the 1st March and the 20th April, provided that the sale of elvers and their possession for sale be made illegal after the latter date, and they also suggested that a small license duty might be imposed on the elver takers. The elver fishers, on the contrary, do not desire to continue the capture of elvers after the 30th April. After that day the fish become black, bony, and unfit for food. There is practically, therefore, only a difference of 10 days between the Conservators and the elver fishers.

The elver fishers allege, on the one hand, that the elvers run up the Severn in such numbers that it is impossible to take more than a tenth part of them. The Conservators, on the contrary, declare (1.) that the immoderate capture of elvers has led to a decrease in the supply and the take of eels, (2.) that the price of eels has consequently risen, and (3.) that the elvers do not run up the river as they used to do beyond Tewkesbury.

There can, we think, be very little question that the produce of particular eel fisheries on the Severn has fallen off of late years. One witness, for instance, assured us that he had known 16 cwt. of eels taken in a night in one fishery where half a hundredweight is a good take now; and similar evidence was given us by other fishermen. But on the other hand it was proved to us that the number of eel nets on the Severn had of late years largely increased; that there were 100 nets in the river between Gloucester and Worcester, where one witness had 40 years ago recollected less than 10. This undoubted increase in the number of nets unquestionably detracts from the importance of the allegation that the yield of particular engines is declining. We are inclined, on the whole, to conclude that these fisheries have fallen off; though the decrease in their yield has, we think, been hardly so large as might be inferred from the evidence of some of the Conservators' witnesses.

The price of eels near the Severn has undoubtedly risen from about 6*d.* to 10*d.* in the last 30 years. But all rises in the price of food are of course capable of a double interpretation. All animal food is dearer than it was, and the price of eels must consequently have been affected by the considerations which have raised the price of similar commodities. The price of eels does not seem to have risen more rapidly than that of mutton and beef. The increase in the population and the distributive powers of railways would alone have accounted for the rise in their price.

Moreover, it is not clear that, because the elvers are not seen to pass up above Tewkesbury, they are all taken below that point. In the memory of many of the witnesses before us, the Severn was free from weirs. During the last 30 years a weir has been built at Tewkesbury. There is no doubt that the elvers pass over this weir, but there is also no doubt that the weir retards their passage. Nor when they are past the weir are they so easily seen as they were before the weir was built. Before the weir was built they were compelled to swim in masses in the slack water at the side of the river. Since the erection of the weir the current of the stream has been steadied and the elvers are able to swim up any part of it. In the olden time they were compelled to hug the bank, where they were easily seen and easily taken. At the present time they are dispersed over the river, and are seen and taken with difficulty.

Under these circumstances we are not prepared to recommend that the elver fishing on the Severn should cease on the 20th April. But we are not prepared on the other hand to say that it should continue to the 1st May. The fairest course will be to divide the time in dispute, and to close the elver fishing after the 25th April in each year.

The Conservators are anxious to insist on the prohibition of the sale of elvers after the period during which their capture is legal. It does not seem possible to make this provision. From inquiries which we have made, we have ascertained that, while the main run of elvers in the Severn is in April, the main run of elvers in the Usk is in May. As no one on the Usk desires to prohibit the capture of elvers, Usk elvers may obviously be sold during the whole of May. What is true of the Usk is probably true of other rivers. It is clearly impossible to prohibit the sale of elvers if elvers may be legally caught in every river in the country but one, and for the above reason we cannot recommend that any legislation relative to the sale of these fish should be sanctioned.

Nor can we recommend that a license duty should be imposed on the elver taker. There is no license duty on the twait net; there is no license duty on the shrimp net; there is no license duty on the eel net; in fact there is no license duty on any net but the Salmon net. The time may come when Parliament may find it necessary to authorise a license duty for all nets used in fishing, but till that time comes we think it inexpedient to impose any license duty, however small, on the elver taker. If the object

of that license duty is to increase the production of eels, the duty ought first to be thrown, not on the elver takers, but the eel nets.

We cannot conclude this report without observing that, trivial as the subject may seem, the elver fishing is a matter of the greatest importance to the poor of Gloucester. Hundreds of men—one witness told us a thousand men—are annually engaged in it. The elvers come at a time, just after the conclusion of winter, when there is little work for the poor, and the elver fishing is regarded as the poor man's privilege. It seems undesirable, except on grounds of the most proved necessity, to interfere with an immemorial custom of considerable advantage to the poorer classes of the community.

On broad principles, then, we should be disposed to say that no legislation affecting elvers is necessary even on the Severn. But, as Parliament has sanctioned legislation of this character on that river for two centuries, and as both the fishermen and the Conservators are agreed that a close season should be enacted, we do not feel ourselves at liberty to recommend that the fishery should be entirely free from restrictions as to close time; and, as we have already stated, we propose to strike a compromise between the Conservators and the fishermen, and to make the close season commence on the 26th April, half way between the dates, viz., the 21st April suggested by the Conservators and the 1st May suggested by the elver takers.

The sum and substance of the whole, then, is:—

1. No legislation for elvers is required for any river except the Severn.
2. All legislation respecting elvers affecting other rivers than the Severn should be repealed.
3. Legislation respecting elvers has been passed for the Severn for the last 200 years.
4. Such legislation does not seem to have been ever enforced.
5. The elver fishermen on the Severn are willing to close the fishing after the 30th April.
6. The Conservators desire a close season commencing on the 20th April.
7. We propose to take the mean between these dates, and that the close season should commence on the 26th April for the Severn alone.
8. Such legislation should be provided by a separate Act, and all legislation respecting elvers should be expunged from the Salmon Acts.

We have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,

FRANK BUCKLAND,
S. WALPOLE,
Inspectors of Salmon Fisheries.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

I have signed this report, with one reservation.

I consider that, if a close time be enacted for the capture of elvers on the Severn, the possession and sale of Severn elvers should be made illegal during this close time.

By the 15th section of the Salmon Act, 1873, it was made illegal to take elvers, but at the same time it was not made illegal to sell them; the practical result of this was that elvers were sold openly during the time that their capture was prohibited.

Should any new legislation as regards Severn elvers take place, I advise that it should be made illegal to sell elvers from the Severn after the legal time for their capture has elapsed. If this is not done, exactly the same difficulty will occur under the new legislation as has now happened under the Act of 1873.

FRANK BUCKLAND.

LONDON:
Printed by George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, M.P., &c. &c.

SIR,

1. IN compliance with the Commission intrusted to us by your appointment of the 14th March we have inquired into the following byelaws proposed for the fisheries of the River Wye, namely—

2. Byelaw No. 1.—"The weekly close season shall commence at 6 o'clock on "Saturday morning, and terminate at 6 o'clock on Monday morning. Heavy penal- "ties are imposed by the Salmon Fishery Acts, 1861 and 1873, for the breach of any "of the provisions relating to the weekly close season as fixed by this byelaw."

3. Byelaw No. 2.—"No person shall use any net (not being a fixed engine) for "taking salmon except as follows: draft net, beating net, tuck net, coracle net, lave "net. Any person using any other net than the above for taking salmon (not being "a fixed engine) shall be liable for each offence to a penalty not exceeding five "pounds."

4. Byelaw No. 3.—"Between the expiration of the first hour after sunset and the "commencement of the last hour before sunrise, no person shall use any net in any "inland waters except a landing net or a net for taking eels. Any person acting in "contravention of this byelaw shall be liable after each offence to a penalty not "exceeding five pounds."

5. We thought it desirable in the first instance to invite the Board of Conservators, and the owners and lessees of the upper, middle, and lower fisheries respectively to appoint deputations to confer with us in the matter; and accordingly at a meeting held on the 31st March we were favoured with the attendance of gentlemen authorised to represent these several interests. On that occasion we failed to induce the parties to effect a compromise; but they agreed to enter into correspondence with us for that purpose, and we have since received a written statement from each, setting forth the concessions which they are willing to make. As the result we regret to state that we have failed to bring about an amicable arrangement.

6. Under these circumstances it was originally our intention to proceed with a formal inquiry in hope of preparing the way to a full and final settlement of the entire question. We found, however, that the Parliamentary return of 1875 on the "Wye River Byelaws," and the notes of the evidence taken at Ross so recently as December 1874, at the very full inquiry then held by Mr. Patterson and the inspectors of salmon fisheries, afford ample materials to enable us to form an opinion upon the particular byelaws set forth in our Commission, and to justify our making the recommendations we propose to offer.

7. This being so, we do not feel justified in proceeding with a general inquiry, as we fear there would be no hope of its being entered upon by the parties in that spirit which alone would give promise of success. And we are fortified in this belief by statements repeatedly made by one of the parties, that no further inquiry would be satisfactory unless the evidence were taken upon oath. We have, therefore, agreed upon the following report:—

8. We are impressed with a belief that in the upper waters of the Wye there has been in the last few years a serious decrease in the number of breeding fish. As regards the middle and tidal waters there was evidence before the Commissioners in their inquiry at Ross of an increase in the size of the fish in the previous years, while

[C.—1537.] *Price* ½*d.* 39703.

doubt existed as to an increase in number. From the last reports of the Inspectors it appears that in 1875 there was also an increase in the number in the middle waters, but a continued decrease in the upper waters.

9. The evidence greatly varies as to the cause of the decrease in the latter. On the one hand it is attributed almost exclusively to over netting and night netting in the middle and tidal waters; on the other hand, to the increase of pollution in the upper portions of the river, caused by mines and town drainage. And much destruction of fish at all times of the year, but especially in the close season, is ascribed to poaching, which is said to have largely increased during the last few years.

Having given our best consideration to the subject in all its bearings, we have come to the following conclusions.

10. It appears to us that the weekly close time specified in Byelaw No. 1 has been adopted by the Boards of Conservancy of many of the principal salmon rivers of the Kingdom with great benefit to all parties concerned, and that it is adapted to a river of such length as the Wye. We therefore recommend that this byelaw be allowed.

11. We think that Byelaw No. 2, which limits the kinds of net to those now in use should also be allowed; for though we attach much weight to reasons which have been adduced before us against any impediment to the improvement of netting, we think that under the rather peculiar circumstances of the Wye fisheries, the Board of Conservators should have opportunities of sanctioning or prohibiting alterations in netting which may materially affect the general interests of the river.

12. With regard to Byelaw No. 3 we have had no exact information before us as to the increase of pollution, which is said to exist in the upper waters, and to be the main cause of detriment in that quarter; nor have we had more than very general evidence as to the extent of poaching, and the illicit destruction of fish.

13. In the Wye as in every other salmon river the permanent success of its fisheries depends so essentially on the cordial co-operation of the proprietors of the upper stream for the protection of its spawning beds, that we have been anxious to remove every obstacle which could be proved to exist to the latter enjoying a fair share of the advantages of the river, but in the absence of fuller information on the above important points we are unable to attribute the deficiency complained of in the upper waters, at any rate, exclusively to night netting. Seeing, moreover, that Her Majesty's Government have announced their intention to introduce into Parliament a legislative measure for the prevention of the pollution of rivers, we believe that the real cause of the present deficiencies in the Wye fisheries will thus be best ascertained at a future and early period. Meanwhile we recommend that Byelaw No. 3 be disallowed.

14. And although it is not within the limits of our commission to substitute other byelaws, we venture to suggest that instead of it in the middle waters night netting should not commence till the 1st of April, and further that when a reasonable time has been allowed for the old nets, the size of the mesh for the Wye Fishery District should be two inches and a quarter from knot to knot when wet.

We have, &c.

(Signed) MARCH.
WINMARLEIGH.

ROBERT ANDERSON,
Secretary to the Commissioners.

Home Office, 8th June 1876.

LONDON:
Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

REPORT

OF THE

INSPECTORS OF IRISH FISHERIES

ON THE

SEA AND INLAND FISHERIES OF IRELAND,

FOR

1875.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

DUBLIN:
PRINTED BY ALEXANDER THOM, 87 & 88, ABBEY-STREET,
PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1876.

[C.—1467] *Price* 1*s.* 3*d.*

CONTENTS.

	Page
REPORT,	3
APPENDIX,	29

REPORT

OF THE

INSPECTORS OF IRISH FISHERIES

ON THE

SEA AND INLAND FISHERIES OF IRELAND, FOR 1875.

TO HIS GRACE JAMES, DUKE OF ABERCORN, K.G.,

LORD LIEUTENANT-GENERAL AND GENERAL GOVERNOR OF IRELAND.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

In conformity with the 112th sec. 5 & 6 Vic., cap. 106, we beg to submit our Report for the year 1875, being the seventh since our appointment.

SEA FISHERIES.

The number of craft of all descriptions engaged in fishing for sale according to the Coast Guard returns, in 1875, was craft 5,919, and the crews 23,108.

The number of craft solely engaged in fishing was 1,341, and crews 6,241 ; nearly altogether engaged fishing, craft 602, crews 1,870 ; only partially employed in fishing, craft 3,976, crews 14,997.

The return by the Collectors of Customs as to fishing vessels and boats, and their crews, was for the former 6,286, and men and boys 26,847. Showing a difference of 367 more craft, and 3,739 more men and boys, as compared with the Coast Guard returns.

The difference to some extent may be accounted for as regards the crews by the fact that persons registering usually give the number of hands required to man their boats, and it frequently happens that a single crew suffices for more than one boat. For some time we have taken considerable pains to ascertain the number of boats that fished for sale.

This year we issued precise directions to the Coast Guard on the subject, as will be seen by the following extracts from the Circular addressed to the Inspecting Commanders, and to afford them ample time to make these returns, issued the papers for that purpose some months earlier than formerly—

INSTRUCTIONS to the COAST GUARD for COLLECTING the SEA FISHERY STATISTICS for 1875.

1. No boat engaged exclusively in Salmon Fishing should be returned.
2. No vessel or boat should be returned as fishing craft unless some portion of the fish taken is sold. Care should therefore be taken not to include boats in the return which are employed for other purposes only, or which only capture occasionally for the use of the owner or crew.
3. To return only as fishermen persons employed in fishing boats that capture for purpose of sale.
4. To ascertain the actual number of persons who fish for purpose of sale, and not to adopt the system of only ascertaining the number of boats regardless whether they fish for sale or not, and assigning to each a certain amount of crew without ascertaining whether such exist or not.

We believe that the returns for 1875 show pretty accurately the number of boats, a portion at least of whose capture is offered for sale. In consequence of our instructions, no doubt many boats returned until lately as fishing boats, and men appearing on the returns as fishermen, have been expunged ; and to this circumstance in some degree is attributable the apparent great decrease in craft and crews in 1875 as compared with 1874 ; the former being 1,327 less, and the latter 3,816.

The Custom House returns, however, go to prove that a considerable diminution in boats and men took place this year, as the registration under the Board of Trade

continues the same as before, from which it would appear that there are 276 less fishing vessels and boats, and 1,370 less men and boys in 1875 than in 1874.

It has been argued that owing to the measures we have adopted to exclude from our returns all boats except those a portion of whose capture is offered for sale, and to enumerate as fishermen only those who are engaged in such boats, that the diminution in both is made to appear more than it actually is.

It has also been urged that if the same instructions were issued in 1846 and other years previous to the famine, the number of craft and crews would not appear as large then as we now quote them. To what extent this is true we are not in a position to say. Taking 1846, however, as an illustration, it should be borne in mind, that as compared with 1876, the population was then considerably more.

It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose from the greater demand for fish that there must necessarily have been, with the larger population as compared with the present, there was a considerable open for the boats enumerated to fish for purpose of sale. Besides this, from the larger population, and their better circumstances as contrasted with the people for many years subsequent to 1846, it may be fairly conjectured that most of the boats had their own crews, and not as occurred in later years, when the same individuals often furnished crews in turn to two or more boats.

Be this as it may, our duty consists in giving the figures as we find them left by our predecessors, and whilst fully admitting the likelihood that many of the boats were not as strictly fishing boats as those contained in our enumeration, still we submit that fishing boats must have formed a very considerable part of the decline which has taken place in craft around the coast for the last thirty years.

NUMBER of VESSELS and BOATS, MEN and BOYS, EMPLOYED in the COAST FISHERIES, from 1846 to 1875, inclusive.

Year.	Vessels and Boats.	Men and Boys.	Year.	Vessels and Boats.	Men and Boys.
1846	19,883	113,073	1861	11,845	48,624
1848	19,652	81,717	1862	11,590	50,220
1849	18,100	71,505	1863	11,375	48,601
1850	15,247	68,380	1864	9,300	40,946
1851	14,756	64,612	1865	9,455	40,802
1852	11,789	58,863	1866	9,444	40,663
1853	12,381	49,208	1867	9,332	38,444
1854	11,079	49,227	1868	9,184	39,339
1855	11,251	47,854	1870	9,099	38,650
1856	11,069	48,774	1871		
1857	12,758	53,673	1872	7,914	31,311
1858	11,823	52,101	1873	7,181	29,307
1859	11,881	50,115	1874	7,246	26,924
1860	13,483	55,630	1875	5,919	23,108

The reports from the inspecting commanders of Coast Guard in the twenty-nine divisions into which the coast is divided, continue to represent the fishermen as most orderly and peaceably disposed; no conflicts or disputes worth notice appear to have taken place for many years. They seem to be about the most inoffensive and harmless part of the population.

In the greater portion of the divisions, the fisheries are reported as not improving.

In two or three they are to a small extent. In most of them farming is combined with fishing.

In some the fish are stated to be keeping further out to sea than formerly.

In sixteen divisions, portions of the coast are unguarded in some places for upwards of fifty miles at a stretch.

The continued diminution of the Coast Guard is very much to be regretted for the sake of the fisheries and the coast population. They have proved most useful in judiciously enforcing the fishery laws and obtaining statistics and other valuable information.

From their orderly habits they afford an excellent example to the people with whom they live on cordial terms, and often give useful information too, on subjects connected with fishery avocations.

Requests having been made from time to time to us to take steps towards having an association formed for the purpose of insuring fishing boats, we addressed the following Circular to the Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guard in the twenty-nine divisions :—

"I have been directed by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries to call your attention to the following extract from their last Report":—

"'No public marine insurance companies exist for insuring fishing craft in the kingdom, such insurance being effected in England by the owners of fishing vessels amongst themselves; the same class in Ireland

having no such associations labour under considerable disadvantage. Some of them have so strongly represented the matter to us that we are most desirous of assisting them to get up similar mutual insurance associations to those which are to be found on some parts of the English coast, and for this object will endeavour to ascertain how many boat owners will join as soon as the principles have been decided upon on which such an association should be worked.'"

"'The operations must necessarily be confined at first to boats worth not less than £50, as it would be extremely difficult to make adjudications with respect to damages or proportions to be contributed in the case of boats of smaller value.'"

"The Inspectors will feel obliged if you will be good enough to ascertain how many owners of registered first-class boats in your division would be willing to join a mutual insurance association, and request that you will insert on the enclosed form the names of the owners willing to join, and the numbers, nature, and tonnage of the craft they would propose to insure."

"From inquiries made by the Inspectors as to the regulations which exist with regard to similar associations in England, the following occur to them as being suitable to Ireland":—

1. "That the Directorate of the Association shall determine what craft shall be accepted for purpose of insurance, such decision to be based on the age and condition of the vessel or boat."

2. "That on a vessel or boat being accepted the owner shall pay Ten Shillings entrance and One Pound per cent. on the value, in order to form a fund to enable losses to be promptly paid, and as a guarantee to insurers that there are means sufficient to meet demands."

3. "That not more than two-thirds of the proved loss, which must be total, and confined to the craft only, can be recovered from the Association."

4. "That on a vessel being lost and the claim for compensation established to the satisfaction of the Directorate, the Secretary shall demand from members their proportion of the loss, the amount to be in proportionate ratio to the sum they have insured with the Association. Payment to be made within six weeks after the demand."

5. "The necessary surveys with regard to the condition of craft and investigations into losses to be made by the Surveyor of the Association. The Directorate of the latter to be at liberty to remove any vessel from the list of those insured when they should deem her unseaworthy."

"As the foregoing forms only a general outline of what the Inspectors consider would be desirable, they would feel obliged for any suggestions which may occur to you, and would be glad if you would invite suggestions from the owners of fishing craft and forward such as you may deem worthy of attention."

The number of boat owners who expressed themselves willing to join amounted to seven, so that we saw that this most desirable undertaking would be impracticable.

Representations having been made to us of the probable existence of large unworked oyster beds off the coast of Wicklow, at a greater distance from land than those frequented by the dredgers, we obtained the use of H. M. S. *Goshawk* for the purpose of making investigations. We provided suitable dredging apparatus, and sent an experienced dredgerman on board to conduct the operations. The result of the investigations, carefully carried out by the Commander, was such as to satisfy us that no amount of oysters worth the trouble of dredging for existed at the places indicated.

Some investigations carried on more northward met with a similar result.

We have not yet received from the head of the Natural History Department of H.M.S. *Challenger* any information on certain investigations which we requested should be made "as to the manner in which different descriptions of edible fish dispose of their ova, whether by depositing it on the sea bottom or voiding it in the ocean."

We expect that during 1876 the investigations which are being made in Galway Bay at our request by the Coast Guard, embracing every month in the year, for the purpose of ascertaining how far the assertions so often made by the opponents of trawling, as to the quantity of spawn and immature fish taken up by the trawl nets, is correct, will be concluded. So far as the reports made to us up to the present go, we have only to repeat our statement of last year—that "there is nothing to sustain the objections urged by those opposed to trawling."

Owing to the increasing scarcity of lobsters, we requested the Coast Guard officers to ascertain as far as possible whether it would be well to prohibit the taking of them during some period of the year. As will be seen in their reports, the answers vary considerably.

From the inquiries we made ourselves amongst the fishermen, nothing conclusive could be ascertained, as those engaged in the capture were in most cases influenced by what they deemed would be for their immediate advantage, that class being usually unwilling to make any present small sacrifice for future benefit. We are disposed to think that restricting the size of lobsters taken would be preferable to a close season.

Around a great portion of the coast, owing to tempestuous weather, lobster fishing cannot be followed for months together; so that, with the exception of a few places, a close season practically exists. The great evil to be complained of, therefore, is the taking and sending to market lobsters of very small size.

This might be remedied by the prohibition we have suggested.

For this purpose an Act should be passed, as we do not possess power for the purpose. A similar regulation with regard to crabs would be desirable.

Having so frequently urged the great necessity of having permanently attached to this department a suitable cutter or steam boat under our control, and stated at length the reasons why such would be most desirable, we consider it unnecessary to repeat the same arguments over again. We, therefore, confine ourselves to saying, that our usefulness would be much increased if we were provided with the means we have so often sought for to enable us to carry on our duties as efficiently as we would wish.

Herring Fishery.

This fishery may be said to be almost confined to the east coast, from Arklow to Ardglass, as will be seen by the following table. The value of the capture brought into the six harbours enumerated amounted to nearly £200,000. The capture on the whole was less than in 1874, but the price better.

Fishery Station.	No. of Mease captured, 1874.	Average price per Mease, 1874.	Gross Receipts, 1874.	No. of Mease captured, 1875.	Average price per Mease, 1875.	Gross Receipts, 1875.	Decrease in capture, 1875.	Increase in capture, 1875.	Decrease in amount realized, 1875.	Increase in amount realized, 1875.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.			£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Howth, . . .	101,405	1 0 0½	101,518 9 0	67,371	1 6 10½	90,502 5 6	34,034	—	11,016 3 6	—
Arklow, . . .	17,211	—	19,314 5 0	14,875	1 6 3	19,527 14 0	2,336	—	—	213 9 0
Ardglass, . . .	54,576	—	41,721 15 0	76,957	0 17 0¾	65,671 7 6	—	22,381	—	23,949 12 6
Kilkeel, . . .	6,220	—	—*	1,600	0 17 6	1,360 0 0	4,620	—	—	—
Greenore, . . .	7,170	—	—*	15,311	1 0 2½	15,471 0 0	—	8,141	—	—
Omeath & Warrenpoint,	2,937	—	2,495 9 0	4,208	0 15 11¼	3,353 5 6	—	1,271	—	857 16 6
Total, . .	189,519			180,322		195,885 12 6				

Total capture at above Stations, 1874, ... 189,519 Mease.
„ „ 1875, ... 180,322 „
Total Decrease, ... 9,197 „

* Amount realized in 1874 not stated.

The highest number of boats of each country at Howth on one day was—Cornish, 219 ; Irish, 197 ; Scotch, 142 ; Manx, 125.

At Ardglass, the highest average number that fished during one week was—Scotch, 175 ; Manx, 52 ; Irish, 40 ; Cornish, 20.

Mackerel Fishery.

There were over 121,533 boxes of six score each captured during the season, the prices varying from 1*s.* 2½*d.* to £3 10*s.* per box ; the total amount realized, as far as can be ascertained from returns, being nearly £74,000.

In 1874 the capture was 100,000 boxes, prices varying from 5*s.* to £4 per box.

As in 1874, this includes little, if any, of the fish captured by French boats, which were fishing in considerable numbers off the coasts.

During the mackerel season at Kinsale, there were seven steamers constantly engaged conveying the fish to England, and occasionally three additional ones, besides nineteen Jersey sloops, &c., employed in the same way ; twenty-one vessels of different sorts, as hulks, for holding ice, boxes, and for packing ; the quantity of ice imported for packing the fish, 3,157 tons. Unfortunately, owing to a scarcity of ice and boxes, the fish at times brought very low prices, or the money value would have been much greater.

It is gratifying to find that the Irish boats are increasing in number, and the reports as to the fishermen engaged in them very satisfactory. It is to be regretted that most of those belonging to the port of Kinsale are undecked, and not so well adapted for other modes of fishing as the generality of the boats present during the season. In the case of the Scotch, Manx, and English boats, most of them directly the mackerel season is over, commence at the herring fishing, which gives them remunerative employment for the three more months immediately following ; whilst, when the mackerel season ends, the Kinsale men generally have to take to line fishing, piloting, &c., &c., which is not so remunerative.

It is also alleged that the Kinsale boats draw too much water, so that they are in this respect not so well adapted for the herring fishery.

Pilchard Fishery.

For a number of years pilchards have been frequenting the shores of the counties of Cork and Kerry in immense quantities, whilst the Cornish fisheries have apparently been declining. It is considered that the Italian markets, for which this fish is specially cured, will absorb yearly about 30,000 hogsheads at remunerative prices ; whilst the exports from Cornwall during the last twenty-two years only amount to 341,783

hogsheads, or a yearly average of 15,990, or about half of what it is considered Italy will consume. Further than this, during the years 1874 and '75, the entire exports are, for the former 7,543½, and the latter 7,337½, the price realized in 1875 being higher than has been known for very many years.

Being fully impressed with the great importance of endeavouring to re-establish what was in former years a very profitable and important industry in this part of Ireland (for, by the old histories of the county Cork, the pilchard fishery was at one time of great value), authority was applied for, and obtained from the Government, for one of the Inspectors to visit the principal places in Cornwall where these fisheries have been successfully prosecuted, to obtain general information in reference to the fishery which might prove useful in this country.

The result of this visit was, that a Cornish gentleman, largely interested in the pilchard fisheries, was induced to come over to Ireland to inspect the different localities, and to ascertain from his own observation whether or not one could be found suitable for such a fishery, and if established, whether good results might be anticipated. This gentleman, after careful inspection and inquiry, fixed upon Bantry as a place giving great promise of success; in the first place from the facilities it possessed in having a good quay, alongside which vessels might come to load and unload; from the facility with which labour could be obtained; and lastly, from the fact that for several years large shoals of pilchards were constantly seen from July until January in that part of the bay between Whiddy Island and the town of Bantry, which is peculiarly well sheltered and close to the place where the fish could be cured.

Promises had been made by some residents in the locality that if it were determined to start a pilchard fishery, any money that might be required should be forthcoming. So proposals were made by the gentleman before referred to, to make a commencement by forming a small company with a capital of £2,000, which it was calculated would provide for the taking and curing of about 1,500 to 2,000 hogsheads. Of this capital, the Cornish gentleman himself and a relative proposed to invest £600, some gentlemen in Cork £300, from Dublin £100, whilst the locality itself, which would principally benefit by an enterprise of the kind being established, would only contribute £300, thus £1,300 only of the amount required could be got together. The feeling of the gentleman who made the proposals was that it would not do to embark in a thing of the kind without more local support. The affair, therefore, fell through, and we fear is not likely again to be revived.

This is much to be deplored, for we believe that vast revenues might be derived from this industry, which would not only find their way to the pockets of the persons investing, but by giving great employment to men, women, and even children, would do much to improve the condition of the humbler classes in the district.

An attempt is being made this year by two gentlemen in the locality, in addition to what is done by the ordinary fishermen, to capture and cure for home consumption, and it is to be hoped that their efforts may be so successful as to induce others to join in attempting it on a large scale for the foreign market.

The Oyster Fisheries.

In our Report of last year we entered so fully into the subject, that we have now not much to add.

With few and unimportant exceptions, little appears to be done on the licensed beds, comprising 18,533 acres in the way of production.

To meet this want, some of the proprietors have been importing large quantities of small oysters from France.

As the importation has only lately commenced, we are unable to pronounce positively whether the experiment is likely to succeed, but so far as it has gone it appears to be encouraging.

As one to two-year old oysters may be landed in Dublin, as low as £1 per thousand, and two years ought, under favourable circumstances, to render them fit for table; the profits at anything like the present prices for full grown oysters would be enormous.

The reports made to us as to fall of spat last season are so very conflicting as to render it extremely difficult for us to pronounce whether on the whole there is any improvement, as compared with the two or three preceding years. We are disposed to think that there has been a larger deposit in 1875 than 1874, although in some localities little or none appeared.

The number of barrels taken at Arklow was 9,622, producing £9,426 7*s.*, at an average price of 19*s.* 7*d.* per barrel, as compared with 7,520 taken in 1874, producing £7,236 13*s.*, showing an increase of 2,102 barrels, and £2,189 14*s.* in the amount realized.

The take in Arklow is, however, very much influenced by the weather, and the state

of the Bar this year was more favourable for dredging operations than the preceding one.

At Mr. Berridge's beds in the county Galway, formerly the property of the Law Life Insurance Company, 1,136 tubs were raised, producing £3,685 10*s*. This is an advance on last year, but is not a proof of increased productiveness, as the quantity taken from the store beds is very much at the discretion of the proprietors. The production beds at Rossmack Bay, once about the best in Ireland, have so largely participated in the general decline that the proprietor has commenced importing small oysters from France.

We could not ascertain with accuracy the quantity taken at Clew Bay, Cork Harbour, and other places.

During the year we granted four new licences for cultivation, and, in consequence of the conditions on which they were granted not having been fulfilled, revoked five.

As other duties permit, we propose holding further inquiries, with a view of cancelling licences, where cultivation is not properly carried out.

During the year we passed the following by-laws :—

For Part of the River Shannon.

1. Prohibiting for the space of two years the dredging for oysters in Poulnasherry Bay in the River Shannon, north of a line drawn from Bournahard Point to Querrin Point, in the county of Clare.

First,—That during the close season for oysters in the said River Shannon, or in any of the bays or inlets thereof, no boat, in the said River Shannon, or in any of the bays or inlets thereof, shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters ; and if, during the period aforesaid, there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

Second,—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking oysters in said River Shannon, or in any of the bays or inlets thereof, shall cull all such oysters as may be taken or caught, and shall not remove from any fishing ground or oyster bed any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half at the greatest diameter thereof ; and shall immediately throw back into the water all oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing ; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, or shore of said River Shannon, or of any of the bays or inlets thereof, by any means whatsoever, any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half at the greatest diameter thereof ; nor sell, expose for sale, give, transfer, or purchase, receive, carry, or have in his or her custody or possession any such oysters so taken ; and any person offending in any respect against this by-law, rule, or regulation, shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

" Third,—All persons are hereby prohibited from throwing into the water, on any oyster bed or oyster fishing ground in said River Shannon, or in any of the bays or inlets thereof as aforesaid, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the oyster fishery ; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

" Fourth,—No person shall, between sunset and sunrise, dredge for, take, or catch, any oysters within said River Shannon, or within any of the bays or inlets thereof as aforesaid ; and every person acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

2. For Lough Swilly, in the county of Donegal.

" First,—That during the close season for oysters in the said Lough Swilly, or in any of the bays, creeks, or inlets thereof, no boat, in the said Lough Swilly, or in any of the bays, creeks, or inlets thereof, shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters ; and if, during the period aforesaid, there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

" Second,—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking oysters in said Lough Swilly, or in any of the bays, creeks, or inlets thereof, shall cull all such oysters as may be taken or caught ; and shall not remove from any fishing ground or oyster bed any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half at the greatest diameter thereof ; and shall immediately throw back into the sea all oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing ; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, or shore of said Lough Swilly, or of any of the bays, creeks, or inlets thereof, by any means whatsoever, any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half at the greatest diameter thereof, nor sell, expose for sale, give, transfer, or purchase, receive, carry, or have in his or her custody or possession, any such oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid ; and any person offending in any respect against this by-law, rule, or regulation, shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

" Third,—All persons are hereby prohibited from throwing into the water, on any oyster bed, or oyster fishing ground, in said Lough Swilly, or in any of the bays, creeks, or inlets thereof as aforesaid, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the oyster fishery ; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

3. For Tralee bay, in the county of Kerry, as follows :—

" First,—That during the close season for oysters in the said bay of Tralee, no boat in the said bay of Tralee shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters ; and if during the period aforesaid there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

" Second,—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking oysters in said bay of Tralee shall cull all such oysters as may be taken or caught ; and shall not remove from any fishing ground or oyster bed any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half at the greatest diameter thereof, and shall immediately throw back into the sea all oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing ; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, or shore of said bay of Tralee, by any means whatsoever, any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the

greatest diameter thereof; nor sell, expose for sale, give, transfer, or purchase, receive, carry, or have in his or her custody or possession any such oysters so taken; and any person offending in any respect against this bye-law, rule, or regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds."

5. For Cork harbour we have repealed the bye-laws dated 28th October, 1853, and in lieu thereof have made the following:—

"First,—That between the 1st day of May and the 1st day of September in any year no boat shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters; and if between the periods aforesaid there shall be on board any boat in said Cork harbour, and the estuaries of the rivers flowing into same, any such dredge or other implement for the taking of oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

"Second,—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking oysters shall cull all such oysters as may be taken or caught; and shall not remove from any fishing ground or oyster bed any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof; and shall immediately throw back into the water all oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, bed, or shore of said Cork harbour, and the estuaries of the rivers flowing into same, by any means whatsoever, any oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof; nor sell, expose for sale, give, transfer, or purchase, receive, carry, or have in his or her custody or possession any such oysters so taken; and any person offending in any respect against this bye-law, rule, or regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds.

"Third,—All persons are prohibited from throwing into the water on any oyster bed or oyster fishing ground in said Cork harbour, or the estuaries of the rivers flowing into same, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the oyster fishery; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

"Fourth,—No person shall, between sunset and sunrise, dredge for, take, or catch any oysters in said Cork harbour, or the estuaries of the rivers flowing into same; and every person acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds."

Fishery Piers and Harbours.

Only one harbour was recommended for 1875, that of Cheek Point, in the county Waterford.

Bills have been introduced in Parliament to enable the important works recommended for the improvements of Arklow and Ardglass to be proceeded with.

When these harbours are put into a proper state a vast impetus will be given to fishery enterprise along the east coast.

At present owing to the shifting bar at the entrance to Arklow, the boats are frequently prevented from going out for weeks at a time.

At Ardglass hardly any winter fishing can be prosecuted owing to insufficient shelter. Even in the summer fishing vessels are often prevented from going to sea owing to the ruinous state of the harbour.

We regret to perceive by the Report of the Board of Works that in consequence of the proposed improvements at Arklow and Ardglass, the Treasury has directed no further applications to be forwarded for the present for grants in aid of fishery piers from any other places, with the exception of Kinsale.

The following return has been furnished by the Board of Works with respect to the piers and harbours recommended by this Department during the last two years.

Glin, county Limerick,	Completed.
Giles'-quay, county Louth,	In progress.
Courtmacsherry, county Cork,	Nearly completed.
Greystones, county Wicklow,	No recommendation, Engineer's report not being favourable.
Poul-Hurrin, Gortalia, county Donegal,	Engineer's examination not yet made.
Malinbeg, county Donegal,	Do. do.
Port-Oriel, Clogher Head, county Louth,	In progress.
Inisboffin, county Galway,	Completed.
Inishark, county Galway,	Do.
Tawney, county Donegal,	Engineer's examination not yet made.
Muckross, county Donegal,	Do. do.
Ballysaggart, county Donegal,	Do. do.
Scattery Island, county Clare,	Engineer's estimate £700. Communicated to memorialists—no reply.
Bournapeaka, Ballyvaughan, county Clare,	In progress.
Smeerogue or Poalally, county Galway,	Engineer's examination not yet made.
Molranny, county Mayo,	Engineer's estimate sent to memorialists. Awaits presentment and contribution.
Scilly, Kinsale, county Cork,	Inquiry as to the best site.
Burton Port, county Donegal,	Engineer's estimate communicated to the memorialists, who propose a smaller sum.
Rathmullan, county Donegal,	In progress.
North Harbour or Kearn's Port, Cape Clear, county Cork,	Recommended to Treasury for consideration.
Ardglass, county Down,	Bill introduced into Parliament.
Cheekpoint, county Waterford,	Not yet reported on by Engineer.

Administration of Loans under the Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act, 37 and 38 Vic., cap. 86.

Owing to various causes the administration of this Act did not come into operation until the month of April.

We lost no time in making local inquiries into the applications made to us.

Our first recommendation was made to the Board of Works on 27th April, that department being charged with the disbursement and collection of the loans.

We continued to forward our recommendations until we had disposed of the applications we had received.

Our last recommendation was forwarded on 31st December.

Owing, we presume, to unavoidable causes, the Board of Works did not commence to issue the loans until July.

The disbursements continued until end of the year.

The sum available for 1875 for the eight maritime counties included in the Act was distributed as follows :—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Kerry,	2,728	13	10	Limerick,	559	7	8
Galway,	1,405	1	8	Sligo,	521	3	11
Cork,	1,134	16	9	Clare,	468	5	10
Mayo,	851	10	11	Leitrim,	310	6	10

The amount disbursed was £5,932, distributed as follows :—

	£		£		£
Kerry,	2,209	Mayo,	724	Clare,	315
Galway,	1,112	Limerick,	–	Leitrim,	50
Cork,	1,055	Sligo,	467		

Number of loans made in 1875—358, as follows :—

Kerry,	91	Cork,	58	Sligo,	29	Leitrim,	2
Galway,	64	Mayo,	60	Clare,	54		

The first repayments of the instalments of loans become due on 1st February, 1876.

Owing to the late period of the year at which many of the fishermen received the loans, they were unable to make use of them for the summer fishing, and consequently in numerous instances they did not prove as useful as they would otherwise have done.

They have alleged this as a reason in many instances for the non-expenditure of the loan up to the periods of our making examinations as to the outlay ; promising, however, that in due time everything received would be expended for the purposes intended.

In each case we required the applicants and securities to be recommended by a clergyman, magistrate, landowner, or some other responsible person from the locality. In addition to this, as far as practicable, we saw the referees, applicants, and securities, before deciding on an application, and informed ourselves by every means at our command as to the probability of the money being properly expended, and as to the solvency of the securities.

An essential condition to the granting of a loan was that a portion of the fish captured should be offered for sale.

Although we cannot fail to have been imposed on in some instances, we believe the cases to be very few, and that with these exceptions the money has been expended for the purposes it was advanced.

With regard to the repayment of advances, the Board of Works in their Report for 1875 and 1876, just issued, state, in reference to the loans made to fishermen in 1875, that—

"Up to the 1st April last 335 notes became payable ; of these there are only four in arrear, which legal steps are now being taken to recover.

"If the future instalments are met with the same regularity, we do not hesitate to say that it will reflect considerable credit on this class of people, and that their desire to discharge these debts will bear favourable comparison with other classes."

The Act has been too short a time in operation to enable us to report confidently as to its results. We may venture, however, to say that we consider, so far as it has gone, it has proved advantageous to the coast fisheries. We anticipate that its future working will be such as to justify the strong recommendations in favour of loans contained in all our reports since our appointments, and lead to their extension to the remaining nine maritime counties not included in the Act.

More detailed information will be found in the following reports from each Inspector, on the administration of the loans in the counties in his charge.

Mr. Blake's Report for the County of Galway.

	£	s.	d.
The amount available for 1875 was . . .	1,405	1	8
„ applied for, ...	17,277	0	0
„ approved of, ...	1,382	0	0
„ issued by Board of Works, . .	1,112	0	0

Excessive as the applications were over the amount available, it is surprising that they were not considerably more when all the circumstances are considered.

Soon after the Act was passed an idea became prevalent amongst the coast population of the county Galway, that a very large sum of money—some stated a million—was to be given in loans for fishery purposes, and that advances might be easily obtained. This led to 469 applications, embracing 1,445 applicants, as some of the applications contained four names.

These applications contained 930 securities, so that had funds been available, it would have occupied the entire time of an inspector for fully a year to make the necessary inquiries, besides subsequently investigating into the proper expenditure of the advances.

Numbers of the applicants were wholly unconnected with fishery pursuits, and did not contemplate engaging in them. Some dwelt miles away from the coast and had no knowledge of the management of boats. The securities offered in numerous instances were worthless.

Referees who, from their position, might be expected to exercise more discretion with regard to the persons whom they recommended as borrowers and securities, offered as an excuse their inability to refuse the requests made to them.

The difficult and unpleasant task of selecting persons to grant £1,400 to, out of the nearly £18,000 applied for, had to be gone through as best it could.

With hardly an exception, the population along most of the coast of Galway is the poorest in Ireland. Around the greater part of it a poverty-stricken people eke out a miserable existence from a few inches of wet peaty soil, often half covered with stones, resting on granite. Their desperate necessities leaving them open to the temptation, when opportunity offers, to engage in illicit distillation, on account of the great distance they should carry their scanty grain crop to a market—sometimes twenty miles—very few of them possessing horses or carts, and therefore having to depend for transport to those neighbours better off than themselves.

Many of the applications for loans came from persons as poor as those described.

To four fishermen joined in one application it often occurred that only £20 could be given, and not unfrequently they were obliged to give a portion of this to their securities. Small as the amount to each was it yet enabled several to continue at or enter on fishery pursuits who could not otherwise do so.

Although no great results can be expected from the feeble efforts of such humble fishermen, still some good can be achieved by sustaining them. A fishing population is kept up who, besides adding something to their own scanty means, furnish some additional food to those about them, which otherwise would be lost. The young are taught the management of boats and the use of fishing gear, so that should larger enterprises be at any time established for the better development of the fisheries on the coast of Galway, the loans will probably have proved most beneficial in the way of keeping up the materials for crews.

Besides this, owing to climate and the nature of the land, much of the time of the people on the sea-board, with every disposition to be industrious, is passed in a state of enforced idleness, so that a great boon was conferred on many of them by affording them the means of additional occupation independent of the gain derived from it.

Even the very small sums that most of them obtained or could obtain security for enabled them to do a great deal, all things considered. When it is borne in mind that it is only by the utmost effort and privation that numbers of them make up as low as £2 a year rent for the patches of wretched land they occupy, it can be understood that even £2 to buy a net or lines and hooks is to them a sum so important as to be almost beyond their reach if it were not for the late Act.

Hitherto they were often obliged to resort to an humble description of usurers when they required a small advance, the interest paid being usually 50 per cent.

Their disposition to exert themselves to the uttermost is proved by the fact of the hardships and dangers they willingly incur along their tempestuous coast for the sake of gaining more bread for their families.

Considering other duties to be performed it was quite impossible to investigate whether every loan was properly applied, as in some cases it would have involved an extra journey of over thirty miles going and returning, over bad roads, and occasionally

miles of rowing in a rough sea, in order to learn whether a few pounds had been properly expended, with the chance of not finding the borrower at home.

As far as practicable, however, either a personal investigation was made or information obtained from reliable sources as to whether the money advanced was disposed of for fishery purposes; and, save in a few instances, there are good grounds for supposing that the advances have been applied to the purposes intended.

The first instalments for repayments were punctually met, with four unimportant exceptions, the amounts of which, so far as can be ascertained, were since paid without the necessity of bringing the parties into Court.

Here and there loans have been made to a better class of fishermen than those just described, who, it is expected, have applied the money advantageously, but, owing to the late period at which they received them, and the badness of the autumn and winter fishing, caused by tempestuous weather, were unable to do much. Some advances were made for the building of curing houses on a small scale. Such are calculated to prove most useful as affording a place of sale for fish when there is not a consumption for it fresh. Fishermen are frequently discouraged from going to sea in places distant from markets from an apprehension of not being able to dispose of their capture. Curing houses would do much to obviate this, and would besides prove a great boon to the consumer.

As will be seen the full amount available for 1875 was not disposed of—within £23 was recommended, or £1,382 out of £1,405. Owing to various causes, only £1,112 was taken up, leaving a balance of £293. Of this, £100 was reserved for some fishermen who had applied for considerably more, but owing to the illness of the agent of the property, who had undertaken to afford information as to the most eligible persons, the promised suggestions were not received up to the end of the year.

In addition to this, by the time it was ascertained that some of the recommendations had not been availed of, it was considered too late to make further recommendations from an apprehension, as the season was so far advanced, that the money might be applied to other purposes than fishing.

At the commencement of 1876 notices were issued stating the approximate amount available for the year, and the people made to understand that advances would be made to none save fishermen a portion of whose capture would be offered for sale.

The consequence has been that only £1,211 has been applied for in excess of the £1,189 available.

Irish Reproductive Loan Fund.

Mr. Brady's Report for the Counties of Mayo, Sligo, Leitrim, Clare, and part of Kerry.

In nearly all the places where fishing is carried on in these counties the fishermen are very poor, and have the most miserable appliances for fishing. No boats of a first class order are employed. The fishing is carried on in open yawl and curraghs. In some places the loans to the fishermen have been of a far greater benefit than in others. In places where fishing is the principal occupation of the inhabitants, the loans have been of incalculable benefit, and I am assured, that without them in some places in the County of Mayo the fishermen would have been obliged to go to the workhouse.

In such places the money has been, as far as I could find out, generally fairly and well expended on the fishing materials for which the loans were made. In other places, where fishing forms only a part of the occupation of the inhabitants, and who only follow it principally when herrings or mackerel set in, it is most difficult to ascertain with accuracy whether the loans have been properly applied. To prevent a misapplication of the money, I think, in some cases, it would be more advisable that the materials for fishing, as selected by the fishermen themselves, should be given to them instead of the money. This would insure to a greater extent the proper application of the money in certain cases, than can now with the greatest amount of vigilance and inspection be enforced.

At the commencement of the administration of these loans, I regret to say I met many attempts to obtain loans which amounted to almost fraud on the funds, and could only have been discovered by a personal scrutiny of the applicants themselves.

In some places I found children put forward as applicants for loans. In other places I found applicants living far away from the sea. In other places applicants who, though living near the sea, were never in a boat in the whole course of their lives.

In every case in which I have recommended loans, I have made inquiries not only of the applicants themselves in the locality, but of the Coast Guard, country gentlemen, and others, as to the *bona fides* of the application, and though in a few places I have found subsequently that the money had not been properly applied, and recom-

mended the immediate repayment of the entire loan as provided for in such cases, yet on the whole I think the loans made may be said to have been fairly expended, and I hope with good results; though I am not sanguine that small loans, such as must necessarily be made in those places where fishing forms only a portion of the occupation of the people, will prove a permanent benefit to the fishermen, or will develop the fisheries to any extent.

The following is the return of the loans applied for, recommended, and issued, in the several counties in my charge, viz. :—

1875.

County Limerick.

	£	s.	d.
Amount available,	559	7	8
Amount applied for,	80	0	0
Number of loans granted,	Nil.		

Note.—No one in County Limerick that could be called a sea fisherman.

County Kerry, Portion of.

Amount available for whole County,	2,728	13	10
Amount applied for do.,	6,271	0	0
Number of loans recommended in that portion of county under my charge, 8.			
Amount of same,	125	0	0
Amount issued,	105	0	0
Loans cancelled, 1.			
Amount of same,	20	0	0

The remainder of county included by my colleague, Major Hayes.

County Mayo.

Amount available,	851	10	11
Amount applied for,	6,311	0	0
Number of loans recommended, 72.			
Amount of same,	858	0	0
Amount issued,	754	0	0
Loans not completed by applicants, 10.			
Amount of same,	104	0	0

County Sligo.

	£	s.	d.
Amount available,	521	3	11
Amount applied for,	1,754	0	0
Number of loans recommended, 33.			
Amount of same,	540	0	0
Amount of same issued,	482	0	0
„ „ not issued,	6	0	0
Loans not completed by applicants, 2.			
Amount of same,	32	0	0
Loans cancelled, 1.			
Amount of same,	20	0	0

County Leitrim.

Amount available,	310	6	10
Amount applied for,	255	0	0
Number of loans recommended, 2.			
Amount of same,	60	0	0
Amount issued,	50	0	0

County Clare.

Amount available,	468	5	10
Amount applied for,	1,901	0	0
Number of loans recommended, 69.			
Amount of same,	572	0	0
Amount of same issued,	317	0	0
„ „ not issued,	103	0	0
Loans not completed by applicants, 5.			
Amount of same,	51	0	0

The repayment of first instalments of loans has been made with a great degree of punctuality. None is now due.

Major Hayes' Report for County of Cork.

The amount available for 1875 was £1,134 16*s.* 9*d.*

One hundred and ninety-six applications were received in 1875. Total amount applied for over £7,766.

Eighty-seven of these applications were investigated with great care, the result being that in sixty-four cases loans were recommended for sums amounting in the gross to £1,200.

Of these, fifty-nine were actually advanced—the total amount being £1,060—and five failed to complete their bonds.

Subsequent inquiries as to the application of the money have satisfied me that in forty-nine cases the money was well applied, in three cases not satisfactorily, and there are still six cases which remain to be inquired into.

This result must be considered satisfactory ; and, as far as I have been able to form an opinion in the short time that has elapsed since the Act came into operation, I am inclined to believe it will be productive of much good in improving the condition of those who have availed themselves of the Act by obtaining loans.

Up to the present time the repayment of such instalments as have become due has been well met, and I have no reason to apprehend that loss will result to the Fund from any failure to meet the remaining instalments as they become due, as every care has been taken, before recommending a loan to ascertain that the securities for repayment were ample for the amounts.

County of Kerry.

The amount available for 1875 was £2,728 13*s.* 10*d.*

In that part of the county of Kerry lying west and south of Tralee, there were one hundred and seventy-two applications for loans, the total amount applied for exceeding £6,000.

All of these applications were carefully inquired into, the result being that I was enabled to recommend one hundred and thirteen loans, amounting to a total of £2,694. Of this number, nineteen failed to perfect their securities, so that the total number of loans made in the county was ninety-four for a gross amount of £2,315. The remaining applicants failed to prove that the money applied for was intended for and would be applied for fishery purposes.

I have ascertained by subsequent investigations that sixty-five of the borrowers, who had received between them £1,344, had applied the money properly ; five, representing £120, had not done so ; and the remainder have yet to be inquired into.

I believe in this county as well as in Cork the loans will be productive of good—more especially in those localities where the borrowers are more exclusively fishermen and devote all their time to this pursuit.

THE INLAND FISHERIES.

MR. BLAKE'S REPORT.

Division extending from Wicklow Head to Rossan Point, County Donegal, embracing in whole or part the Counties of Wicklow, Dublin, Kildare, King's County, Meath, Westmeath, Louth, Cavan, Monaghan, Down, Armagh, Antrim, Derry, Tyrone, Donegal, and including the Districts of Dublin, Drogheda, Dundalk, Ballycastle, Coleraine, Londonderry, and Letterkenny.

Dublin District

Extends from Wicklow Head to Skerries, county Dublin, embracing in whole or part the counties of Wicklow, Dublin, Kildare, and Meath.

A slight improvement appears to be going on. The capture was about the same as last year ; the amount of breeding fish the same.

Amount of licence duty, £145 ; being £5 less than in 1874.—Single rods, £97 ; draft nets, £48.

Fishing for salmon without licences with rod and line, under pretence of fishing for other fish, on the increase.

Much fry is taken or destroyed by anglers pretending to fish for trout, perch, or pike. The proprietors of land along the Liffey do not, unfortunately, try to prevent this practice.

In the rivers, and in the open sea off Wicklow Head, guns are sometimes used for killing salmon—a most pernicious practice, owing to the number of fish that escape wounded.

The gas and chemical works on the north and south sides of the Liffey send a large quantity of poisonous matter into the river. When to this is added the vast sewage of the city of Dublin, it is a marvel how any fish succeed in reaching the upper waters or return to the sea from them.

Owing to the want of funds, only three water bailiffs are employed in addition to the Inspector of Water Bailiffs and his assistant. One private bailiff is employed for a few months by a proprietor, and another by the Swords Angling Club.

The riparian owners continue to evince the same indifference with regard to the preservation of the rivers, and with only the above exception, give no aid towards it.

Drogheda District

Extends from Skerries to Clogher Head, and contains part of the counties of Louth, King's County, Meath, Westmeath, and Cavan.

State of the fisheries satisfactory.

Increase in breeding fish ; the stock this year is considerable.

Up to May the capture in tidal waters and the fresh just above was considerable, but fell off greatly afterwards, and so continued until the end of the season. This was attributed to the peale not having come in at as early a period as usual.

Angling was bad, in consequence of the continued want of water preventing the ascent of the fish. Owing to most of the rivers having heavy gradients, they fall with great rapidity.

The season is said to be getting earlier gradually for some years past, and fish are in the best condition at the commencement. Although spring fish had increased for some years previous to 1875, this was not maintained last season, large fish being the exception. Average weight, 14 lbs.; peale up to 7 lbs.; largest salmon taken, 47 lbs.

A good deal of spent fish are destroyed in the upper waters by anglers, and fry, during their descent, notwithstanding considerable exertion on the part of the water bailiffs and Constabulary to protect them.

Offences against the Fishery Laws have greatly decreased.

Fourteen water bailiffs are employed by conservators and one by a private individual.

£335 3*s.* 8*d.* received for licence duty, &c., against £299 10*s.* received in 1874—single rods, £63; cross lines, £8; snap nets, £9; draft nets, £171; fixed engines, £40; gap and eye nets, £3; coghills, £34. £7 3*s.* 8*d.*, proportion of fines. Total, £335 3*s.* 8*d.*

Dundalk District

Extends from Clogher Head, county Louth, to Donaghadee, county Down, embracing in whole or part the counties of Louth, Meath, Down, Armagh, Monaghan, and Cavan.

Capture less productive than the previous year, attributable in some measure to deficiency of water in the fresh-water portion of district. The Board of Conservators consider that to the increased number of nets, and the constant net fishing in 1874, is in a great measure due the diminished productiveness.

The angling was indifferent.

The amount of breeding fish in the rivers greater than in 1874.

Both spring salmon and peale of smaller size than the previous year.

Average weight of former, 14 lbs.; the latter, 5 lbs.

One inspector and seven water bailiffs employed by Board. None by private persons.

Offences against the fishery laws diminishing.

Fish passes much required on some of the rivers, but as the funds of the district hardly suffice for watching, and as neither the riparian proprietors, anglers, or net fishers will contribute anything towards rendering the rivers more productive by facilitating the passage of fish to the spawning grounds, there is no use in calling further attention to the desirability of having fish passes repaired or constructed in certain places.

Some parts of the district continue to suffer severely from flax-water, more especially in the county Down.

Although the district extends to Donaghadee, the Board of Conservators do not take cognizance of anything north of the Newry river, as no revenue of account is received from the county Down.

Lately a disposition has been shown by gentlemen interested in the Quoile river to have fish passes placed on it, and bailiffs appointed for protection.

Should they carry out these intentions, it might be desirable to have the county Down constituted a separate district. There are some naturally good rivers in it now almost destroyed so far as salmon production is concerned, which might to a great extent be restored if proper means were adopted, but this can only be done by the riparian owners taking the matter earnestly up, and this can probably be best accomplished by their being associated together as a distinct board, provided they are willing to contribute the necessary funds for protection, &c.

Receipts for 1875, £169 16*s.* 11*d.*—comprising £155 for licence duties; £9 10*s.* percentage on Poor Law valuation; fines, &c., £3 6*s.* 11*d.*; subscriptions towards water bailiffs, £2.

Ballycastle District

Extends from Donaghadee to Portrush, containing portions of the counties of Down, Antrim, and Derry.

State of the fisheries appears to be satisfactory.

Amount of breeding fish in rivers rather less than in 1874.

Largest salmon taken 28 lbs.

Since the experiment was made of crossing Bann with Bush fish, the average as to size has increased.

No bailiffs are directly employed by the Board, the plan adopted is to give to each proprietor of fisheries a certain sum for protection. The conservators state, "As it was expected, in self interest, the proprietor would see to the preservation himself." To this plan there are some objections. It is calculated to lead to irregularity, and if adopted at all, each proprietor should send in receipted vouchers of his expenditure, in order to have them entered in the accounts of the Board.

Although this plan is stated by the conservators to have "worked well in 1875," they further state that "poaching is much on the increase," which seems inconsistent with good working.

The remarks made with regard to Letterkenny District in reference to the mode of disposing of the funds, appear applicable to this district.

Revenue £340 4*s.* 4*d.*—comprising licence duties, £196; per-centage on Poor Law valuation, £27; fines, &c., £3 13*s.* 4*d.*; subscriptions, £113 11*s.*

The latter item represents the sum paid by owners of fisheries for water bailiffs, in addition to the sum received by them from the funds of the district for that purpose.

Coleraine District

Extends from Portrush to Downhill Boundary, embracing portions of the counties of Monaghan, Armagh, Down, Antrim, and Derry.

Capture on the whole much less than the previous year. In the Bann it was nearly the same as in 1874, but on the coast the decrease was considerable. The stock of breeding fish less.

Average weight of salmon, 10 lbs.

Offences against fishery laws diminished; 136 prosecutions by water bailiffs, and 13 by the constabulary.

Pollutions from paper-mills complained of, but there does not appear to be sufficient desire on the part of the conservators to prosecute. Much injury has resulted from flax-water.

The revenue for the year amounted to £1,075 5*s.* 5*d.* Of this £760 was derived from licence duties, £238 per-centage on Poor Law valuation, and £77 5*s.* 5*d.* for proportion of fines, forfeited engines, and interest on bank account. This shows an increase of £173 5*s.* 5*d.* over the previous year's receipts.

At the earnest desire of the rod fishers, a change was made in the close season for angling with single rod in the Rivers Main, Six-mile-water, Moyola, and Ballinderry, by adding ten days to end of season, and taking fifteen days off the commencement.

Londonderry District

Extends from Downhill Boundary to Malin Head, county Donegal, and includes portions of the counties Derry, Donegal, and Tyrone.

The capture was less productive than the previous year, owing to the want of water.

The amount of breeding fish observed on the beds less than in 1874.

Average size of salmon 11 lbs., peale, 6½ lbs., the latter smaller than previous year.

Pollutions from flax-water continue a cause of complaint.

Although there are 230 bailiffs employed—190 by the conservators, and 40 by the Lessees of the Irish Society, at a cost, it is stated, of £600, in addition to the sum paid by them for licence duty and rate, there is an increase of offences against the fishery laws reported.

The amount of prosecutions appear to be very few, considering the alleged increase of offences, the number of bailiffs employed, and the money expended. Adding the £605 paid by the Lessees of the Foyle Fishery to the £393 received for licence duty, £95, per-centage on Poor Law valuation, and £9 5*s.* 2*d.*, proportion of fines, the revenue of the district amounts to £1,102 5*s.* 2*d.*, a sum which ought to amply suffice for preservation.

Letterkenny District

Extends from Malin Head to Rossan Point, and includes the greater portion of the county Donegal.

A larger capture than in 1874, attributed to the fineness of the weather. The amount of breeding fish also greater.

Average weight of salmon, 10½ lbs.; peale, 5½ lbs.

About 100 bailiffs are stated to be employed. Of these, not more than two, engaged for a short time on the Swilly, are directly paid by the Board. All the others are in the employment of the proprietors of fisheries. The same practice exists in this district as in that of Ballycastle, to return to the proprietors of fisheries the full amount of licence duty paid by them, leaving it altogether to themselves to employ whatever bailiffs they think proper for the protection of their rivers, rendering no account as to the details of expenditure.

In addition to receiving back the whole of their licence duties, the conservators lately divided, amongst the proprietors of rivers, a sum of £168 18*s.* 4*d.*, being the accumulation expenditure accruing for some years previously.

The greater portion, if not the entire, of this was derived from licence duty on bag nets and drift nets, and had not, therefore, been contributed by the parties amongst whom it was divided.

The appropriation was made against the advice and remonstrance of the inspector in charge of the district.

The Department also, in a letter to the solicitor of the Board of Conservators, in reply to one from him on the subject of the division of the funds amongst the proprietors of rivers, expressed their "disapproval of the system of dividing the funds between proprietors, considering that the proper course would be for the Board to meet and appoint water bailiffs, so far as the funds would permit, and that the clerk should receive from such, vouchers for payment, and also for everything expended."

Concluding Remarks.

In nearly every district in my charge, as I have frequently stated, the great evil to be complained of is pollution from flax water.

Having dealt at some length in my last report on this subject, I now have nothing to add beyond an expression of regret that the magistracy do not evince a greater desire to punish the culpable neglect on the part of the flax growers, in not adopting the simple precautions, involving little or no trouble or cost, necessary to prevent the terrible destruction of fish that takes place from allowing the rivers to become contaminated from poisonous matter.

In the flax growing districts the only hope is that other produce will be found more profitable, and that foreign flax will, to a great extent, supersede the home-grown. This, in some measure, is the case already, and with great advantage to salmon production.

In any future legislation on the inland fisheries, there ought to be more stringent regulations than now exist, to preserve the rivers from pollution from flax, and manufacturing refuse.

The same want of liberality on the part of riparian owners, and those who follow angling for sport, which I have alluded to in former reports, prevents much from being accomplished, which might otherwise be done in the way of fish passes, &c.

Most of the persons largely interested in the fisheries, whether as proprietors or as sportsmen, even when possessed of good means, rarely contribute more than the humblest angler, to promote preservation and production, viz., one pound for an angling licence.

Owing to this want of spirit, a vast destruction of salmon takes place in the close season, and hundreds of miles throughout the country of good spawning grounds are nearly or altogether shut out from the breeding fish.

Of all our industrial resources there is not another, perhaps, more capable of increased development than our inland fisheries; and which, for the outlay, would yield such large and certain returns commercially, independent of the great advantage of affording to the people increased facilities for enjoying one of the most innocent, healthful, and attractive of sports.

It is much to be regretted that some means, not open to reasonable objections, has not yet been devised, by which the ascent of fish to the upper waters, where most required, would be facilitated, at the cost of those who would derive the benefit from the increased production which would result.

JOHN A. BLAKE.

MR. BRADY'S REPORT.

Division extending from Dunmore Head, in the county of Kerry, to Rossan Point in the county of Donegal, embracing in whole or part the counties of Kerry, Clare, Limerick, Tipperary, King's and Queen's Counties, Galway, Longford, Westmeath, Roscommon, Leitrim, Mayo, Fermanagh, Cavan, Monaghan, Donegal, and Sligo; and including the districts of Limerick, Galway, Ballynakill, Bangor, Ballina, Sligo, and Ballyshannon.

No. 8, or Limerick District,

Extends from Dunmore Head, in the county of Kerry, to Hag's Head, in the county of Clare, and includes all that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those points.

The general state of the Salmon Fishery in this district is satisfactory.

The take of spring fish in 1875 was more productive than that in 1874. The take of peale or grilse, about the same as in 1874. The greatest portion of the fish is exported; but the quantity actually taken cannot be ascertained, as there is no obligation on the part of either owners of private fisheries or of the public, who exercise their common law rights to a very large extent in this district, to give any details of the quantity captured. There was no perceptible increase in the size of the fish taken during the past five years. The average weight of spring fish was about twenty-two pounds; that of peale or grilse, about seven pounds.

This is the largest district in Ireland, the catchment basin of the Shannon alone being 4,553 square miles, and it is frequented by salmon from near its source to the sea.

In the district, during the past year, there were used 231 single rods; 39 cross lines; 31 snap nets; 70 draft nets; 119 drift nets; 18 pole nets; 31 stake weirs; 1 head weir; 8 boxes or cribs; and 136 gaps or eyes for taking eels.

The licence duty derived from these engines amounted to £2,081 5*s.*; and the amount received for fines, sales of forfeited engines, and interest on bank account, amounted to £141 10*s.* 4*d.*, making a total of £2,222 15*s.* 4*d.*

Although this is a large sum, yet, the district is so extensive and its requirements so great, it is not deemed sufficient to afford that protection which is considered necessary; and the consequence is that the Conservators have not been able to allocate any of their funds for the erection of fish passes, which are much required on many mill-dams.

In former reports I adverted to this matter, and to which I have now nothing to add.

In the tidal waters of the Shannon, a great number of people employ themselves during the season by fishing with drift nets. Though by-laws have been enacted by the Inspectors, restricting these nets in a great measure, the difficulties of enforcing them are so great that complaints are frequently made of the want of their observance on the part of the fishermen.

I believe these complaints are well founded, for I have seen myself many nets fishing contrary to these by-laws.

Without a sufficiently strong naval force much improvement in this respect cannot be expected, and the Board of Conservators say they have not sufficient funds at their disposal to employ such a force.

On a very important breeding river in this district a mill-dam has been erected, if not immediately on, very near to the site of an old dam which had been in existence in former times, but had been removed for many years. The newly erected one forms a greater obstacle to the ascent of fish than the old one. It is much larger and higher in every way. Believing that under the 63rd section of the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106, the proprietor was bound to build therein such a fish pass as would enable salmon to ascend at all times, and that such should be constructed according to plans approved by the Inspectors, he was called on by us to build such a pass. He, however, declined to do so, alleging that he had right to re-erect the old dam for the supply of his new mill, which is a valuable concern, and much larger than the old one.

Acting under advice, prosecutions for penalties were instituted against him; but, on the two occasions on which the complaint was tried, the majority of the Justices decided on dismissing it, on the ground that it should have been brought within six months after the dam had been erected. Against this decision the Justices have been called on to state a special case for the opinion of the Court of Queen's Bench. Should the Court determine that the decision of the Magistrates was correct in law, it may have a serious effect in other cases, and also in the case of erection of gratings at mills.

Galway District

Extends from Hag's Head, in the county of Clare, to Slyne Head, in the county Galway, and includes all that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those points.

The take of fish in this district was less productive in 1875 than in 1874.

It is difficult to assign a cause for this. It is alleged by some that the quantity of fish on the spawning grounds is too large, and that the beds are rooted over so frequently, that much of the spawn deposited is destroyed.

Whether this be so or not, there is not a doubt in my mind, that even under the best systems of management, fluctuations in seasons will occur which cannot be accounted for.

There are few districts in the country better managed ; and the lessee of the fisheries in the most important river in the district, bestows personal care, attention, and expense, in endeavouring to improve the fisheries. In this district, too, no fixed nets are used, and the netting is of a limited character.

The engines used during the past year were :—110 single rods ; 5 cross lines ; 13 draft nets ; 4 trammel nets ; 6 boxes or cribs ; and 22 gaps or eyes for taking eels.

The total revenue of the district for the year was £247. This is largely supplemented by the lessee of the Galway River Fishery, and to some extent by one proprietor of fisheries in the upper waters.

The quantity of breeding fish observed on the spawning beds was greater, and bore a very favourable comparison with the decreased take of last fishing season. There is little, if any, destruction of salmon fry in the district. Very few spent fish are taken, and in the Galway River, full fish are returned by the anglers in October. There are no pollutions or poisonous matters entering the rivers in the district. Offences against the fishery laws have diminished. So that on the whole, though the take of fish has not been so large during the past season, yet the general state of the fisheries in the district is satisfactory, and the prospects very encouraging.

I referred in my last report to the great advantage that would result if the passage between Loughs Mask and Corrib were completed ; but as yet no steps have been taken in the matter.

The by-laws and seasons mentioned in former reports remain unaltered in this district.

Ballynakill District

Extends from Slyne Head, county Galway, to Pigeon Point, county Mayo, and includes all that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those two points.

This is probably the smallest and least important district in the country. The quantity of fish taken during the past season has been less than in the former one.

The engines used in the district were :—53 single rods ; 15 draft nets ; 1 pole net ; and 1 gap or eye for taking eels.

The amount of revenue received from licence duties was £101, and from fines, &c., £14 18*s*. Total, £115 18*s*.

There are about 16 bailiffs employed by private individuals, and 34 by the Conservators ; 4 being for all the year round, and the others for the close season only. Offences against the fishery laws have increased. Very little public right of fishing for salmon exercised in this district. Any improvement, therefore, must be looked for from the exertions of private individuals owning the properties of the salmon fishery in the district. The seasons remain unchanged.

Bangor District

Extends from Pigeon Point, county Mayo, to Benwee Head, and includes all that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those two points.

In this district, the take of fish during the past season has been much the same as in 1874.

The quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers has increased ; but in two very important rivers little protection was afforded during the winter, in consequence of the death of one of the proprietors, and the fishery falling out of lease.

There are about 78 bailiffs employed by the Conservators, at wages of from £2 10*s*. to £20, according to the extent of their duty. These bailiffs are employed for the winter season. Several proprietors of fisheries also employ a number of bailiffs ; but principally

during the open season. The amount at the disposal of the Conservators does not meet the requirements of the district. It is largely supplemented by the proprietors and lessees of the tidal fisheries.

The engines used in this district during the past season were :—29 single rods ; 20 draft nets ; 10 bag nets.

The amount received from licence duty was £189, and from fines, &c., £6 18*s*. Total revenue for the year, £195 18*s*.

Application to extend the angling season in certain rivers in the district was received during the past year from the Board of Conservators, and after public inquiry, it was decided that the season should be extended in three rivers (*see* Appendix No. 12, Table showing close seasons) to the 1st November.

In one river experiments were made to ascertain the quality of the fish in the month of October. The result was such as would not justify me in recommending for the sanction of my colleagues, any extension of the season. In other rivers the proprietors objected to any alteration.

In this district 16 bag nets have been decided to be legal, and certificates accordingly granted for them ; but out of this number only 10 were used during the year.

Offences against the fishery laws increased a little, but chiefly during the open season.

There are no pollutions or poisonous matters entering any of the rivers in this district.

Ballina District

Extends from Benwee Head, in the county of Mayo, to Coonamore Point, in the county of Sligo, and includes all that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those two points.

This is one of the most important, and perhaps, best managed districts in Ireland. The lessees of the tidal fisheries of the River Moy spare neither trouble nor expense to develop the resources of this great river. The take of fish during the past year, however, was less than the previous year, though the quantity of breeding fish was as great. It is impossible to state to what cause the diminution in the capture can be attributed. Everything that can be done under the laws to promote the fisheries has been done by the Conservators and others interested. Fry are strictly preserved during their descent to the sea, all angling for trout being prohibited during the months of April and May.

There are no pollutions or poisonous matters entering the rivers. Gratings have been erected at mills wherever required. Protection during the winter is maintained at a very considerable cost, over 250 bailiffs being employed by private individuals, in addition to over 100 by the Conservators.

During the year there was expended on protection by the Conservators, £342 ; by the lessees of the Moy Fishery, £600 ; by the proprietors of the bag nets in the bay towards the protection of the Rathfran and Ballycastle rivers, which, while the bag nets were discontinued, were wholly neglected, £60 ; and by the proprietor of the Easky river, £15 to £20.

The fisheries in the upper waters, since the opening of the free gap in the Ballina weirs, have become valuable properties, and, in almost every place available between the Weirs and Foxford, nets are used for the capture of the fish. In a former report I fully explained this subject. My only fear with regard to this netting in the fresh waters is that it may be carried on too far, perhaps to the injury of the fisheries in general of the river.

The engines used during 1875, were :—71 single nets ; 1 cross line ; 29 draft nets ; 32 drift nets ; 5 bag nets ; 7 boxes or cribs ; and 13 gaps or eyes for taking eels.

The amount received for licence duty was £389, and for fines, &c., £40 13*s*. 4*d*. Total revenue for year, £429 13*s*. 4*d*.

In my last report I mentioned that drift nets were increasing materially, both in numbers and length. During the past year they have still further increased, and great complaints have been made to me of the injury these nets cause by breaking the schools of fish coming into the bay.

The fishermen who use these nets adopt the practice of setting their nets weighted with heavy stones in the bay, coming ashore and remaining ashore till morning, when they go out and haul the nets. I am not aware of such a practice existing in any other part of Ireland, nor do I think it is a fair or proper way of using drift nets. In every other place that I know of where such nets are used, the boats and fishermen remain with their nets while drifting. It is also hard to believe that nets heavily weighted with stones and abandoned by their owners for the whole night can be considered as drifting.

A prosecution against some of the parties for using a net in the manner described, and thereby making it a fixed net, was instituted by some of the water bailiffs. The magistrates convicted the parties for using a fixed net. An appeal against their decision was taken, and, after inquiry and evidence, the conviction was reversed on the grounds that the net was not fixed. The difficulty of enforcing the law preventing fixed nets being used in this bay, has, under the circumstances, become so great that there is little doubt that before another fishing season arrives it will be found necessary to make some by-laws or regulations with respect to this mode of fishing. In fact, I believe that without the active exertions of the coast-guard on both sides of the bay, it will be impossible for the Board of Conservators to prevent illegal fishing.

The seasons and by-laws in this district remain unaltered.

Sligo District

Extends from Coonamore Point, in the county of Sligo, to Mullaghmore, and includes that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those two points.

The general condition of the fisheries in this district is reported as satisfactory. The take of fish during the past season has been about the same as the previous one. The quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers has been much the same.

Offences against the fishery laws have diminished.

The engines used during the year were :—20 salmon rods; 16 draft nets; 1 bag net; and 6 gaps or eyes for taking eels.

The total revenue of the district was only £84. This, however, is largely supplemented by the lessee of the tidal fisheries of the Sligo, and by the proprietors of the Ballisodare and Drumcliffe rivers and Glencar lake, who employ about 60 water bailiffs. Of the 16 draft nets enumerated above as having been used, some of them are what are commonly called and known as "half tram" or fixed draft nets, and are, as in other districts, only subject to the same amount of licence duty as the ordinary movable draft nets. In many places this is considered as too low for such engines. It is difficult, however, under the present law, to have an increased licence duty imposed on them, unless they could be considered as engines not enumerated in the schedule to the Act 11 & 12 Vic., c. 92. If they could be so considered, certain steps are required by that Act to be taken by the parties proposing to use them, before any licence duty can be imposed by the Board of Conservators, with whom it rests to fix a licence duty on all new engines.

Since the opening of the season in the Sligo river on the 1st January, the lessee of the fishery states the commercial results have largely increased, and the public now receive a supply of salmon of the finest quality, at a period of the year when it is of great value, and when formerly only foreign fish was allowed to be exposed for sale. I have at the opening of the season regularly attended the fishing immediately after midnight of the last day of the year, and remained on the fishing grounds till morning and examined carefully all the fish taken. No fish could be of finer or better quality.

It is stated that a great run of fish took place in the month of December last year. If so, the upper waters ought to be well supplied this year for angling purposes.

Ballyshannon District

Extends from Mullaghmore, in the county of Sligo, to Rossan Point, in the county of Donegal, and includes that part of the country, the waters of which flow into the coast between those points.

This is another large and important district. The principal river is the Erne, and the proprietors of the commercial fisheries in the tideway adopt every means to render this river as productive as possible. They spare no expense in protection, and in endeavouring to develop its resources. The take of fish has been less during the past than the previous season. The Bay of Donegal, into which the rivers of the district flow, were infested during a great part of the year with dog fish. Whether this prevented the salmon entering the rivers, and so reduced the capture, is unknown. In fact, as in other districts well managed and protected, the cause of the decreased production is unknown.

The proprietors of the Erne river have again, during the past close season, been good enough to make experiments as to the quantity of fish running up from the sea, and, with our approval, the boxes or cribs have been kept in fishing order during the greater part of the close season. The following is the result :—

TABLE.

DATE.	No. of Fish Captured.	Weight, &c.	Observations.
August 21,	1	4 lbs. Hen fish,	Fresh.
„ 23,	3	7 lbs., 8 lbs., and 6 lbs. One cock and two hens,	All fresh.
„ 25,	2	7 lbs., 7 lbs. Two hens,	Fresh.
„ 27,	3	6 lbs., 20 lbs., 6 lbs. One cock and two hen fish,	Fresh, dead, fin cut off.
„ 30,	3	6 lbs. each. Two cock and one hen fish,	Do., do.
„ 31,	3	7 lbs., 9 lbs., and 16 lbs. Three cock fish,	Fresh, do.
September 2,	3	7 lbs. each. Hen fish,	Do., do.
„ 6,	2	18 lbs. and 9 lbs. Hen fish,	Do., marked, with medal attached, Nos. 1 and 2.
„ 8,	1	6 lbs. Hen,	Do., do., 3.
„ 13,	1	6 lbs. Hen,	Red, do., 4.
„ 27,	1	10 lbs. Cock,	Do., do., 5.
„ 28,	2	9 lbs. each. Cocks,	Do., do., 6 and 7.
October 1,	1	7 lbs. Cock,	Do., do., 8.
„ 2,	1	10 lbs. Do.,	Do., do., 9.
„ 6,	1	6 lbs. Hen fish,	Fresh, do., 10.
„ 9,	1	7 lbs. Do.,	Do., do., 11.
„ 12,	1	6 lbs. Do.,	Do., do., 12.
„ 14,	1	9 lbs. Cock fish,	Red, do., 13.
—	1	6 lbs. Hen fish,	Bright, do., 14.
„ 19,	1*	10 lbs. Cock,	Red, do., 15.

* This fish was captured by angling in the Bundrowes River on 30th March, 1876, and weighed 12 lbs.

Many fish were marked by means of copper labels with numbers punched thereon, which were attached to the adipose fins, and the fish were liberated. Up to the present only one of these fish has been known to have been captured, and that was considerably high up a neighbouring river early this season, where it was taken by angling, and weighed 12 lbs. When it was liberated and marked it weighed about 10 lbs.

From the experiments made during the past and previous seasons, I think that the stock of this river must depend a great deal on the quantity of fish escaping during the weekly close season.

The by-law which was made permitting the use of small meshed nets in certain parts of the district, and referred to in my last report, was disallowed on the hearing of the appeal by the Privy Council, and the old statutable meshed nets of not less than $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches from knot to knot remain the only legal nets that can be used for the capture of salmon or trout in the district, save in the tideway of the river Erne and in the Inver river down to its mouth as defined, in both of which places nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot are permitted to be used.

The engines used in this district during the past season were :—98 single rods ; 9 cross lines ; 42 draft nets ; 3 pole nets ; 1 stake net ; 4 boxes or cribs ; and 32 gaps or eyes for taking eels.

The total revenue, including £16 4*s.* for fines, &c., amounted to £371 4*s.* 9*d.* This is largely supplemented by the proprietors of the Erne Fishery.

The fisheries in this district suffer occasionally from flax water being allowed to run into some of the rivers. On this subject I can only repeat the observations made in my last report. I believe if what was suggested to me and therein detailed (p. 31) no injury would arise to the cultivation of flax in the country, while a practice which is so destructive in a great many places, particularly in the north of Ireland, would be to a great extent insured against.

GENERAL REMARKS.

In my last report under this head I entered fully into the different matters which I felt it my duty to bring under notice as requiring amendment in the law. Another year's experience confirms me in the views I then expressed, and to which I have nothing to add, but to submit them for your Grace's consideration.

THOMAS F. BRADY.

MAJOR HAYES' REPORT.

Division extending from Slea Head in the County of Kerry in the west to Wicklow Head in the east, and including eight fishery districts—viz., No. 7, Killarney; No. 6^3, Kenmare; No. 6^2, Bantry; No. 6^1, Skibbereen; No. 5, Cork; No. 4, Lismore; No. 3, Waterford; and No. 2, Wexford, which embrace the whole or portions of the following counties, viz.:—Kerry, Cork, Waterford, Tipperary, Limerick, Kilkenny, Carlow, Wexford, Queen's County, King's County, Kildare, and Wicklow.

No. 7.—Killarney District.

Embracing all the waters flowing into the sea, and the fisheries along the coast, between Lamb Head and Dunmore Head, both in the county of Kerry.

The fishing season of 1875, was not generally as productive throughout the district as for several previous years—although in the southern division it is reported that the gross capture of salmon exceeded by about fifteen per cent. that of 1874.

In order to form a fair idea as to the progress of the salmon fisheries in any district, it is necessary, in my opinion, to take the capture for a given number of years, and compare it with that of a like number of years immediately preceding. To form a judgment upon the working of any particular year, however good or bad, would be evidently misleading—salmon seasons, like harvests, being so much dependent upon wind and weather, and other influences, of which little is known. These influences seriously affect individual seasons—for good or bad—but when we compare the capture for a considerable number of years, whether the seasons be good or bad, we are better able to form a judgment as to whether upon the whole we are advancing or retrograding.

It is difficult to obtain reliable statistics of the quantity captured in a district; but in this case, through the kindness of a gentleman largely interested in the subject, and who has every means of knowing, I have been permitted to look over the returns showing the gross capture of salmon for the ten years preceding 1875—viz., 1865 to 1874 inclusive—and I find that, during the latter five years of the period, viz., 1870 to 1874, the captures have so far exceeded that of the first five years—viz., 1865 to 1869, as to show an average yearly increase of nearly one-fourth, whilst at the same time the reports as to the stock of breeding fish have been very satisfactory, showing that the increased capture is not to be attributed in any way to over fishing. I think this may be taken, not merely as an indication, but as positive proof of most satisfactory progress.

In my report for 1873, I referred to a practice unfortunately prevailing in certain localities of the district—viz., the destruction of fish by means of poisoning the pools with lime, and other deleterious materials. I regret to say, that this atrocious practice still prevails on a part of the river Brown Flesk. It is quite useless to expect improvement in a locality where this is permitted to go on, and the most determined efforts should be made by all who are in any way interested, to put down the practice effectually.

During the year some changes have been made in regard to the close season in a part of the district, and which it is hoped may prove advantageous.

There has been a diminution in the average size of the fish captured in 1875—salmon averaging $10\frac{3}{4}$ lbs; peale, $6\frac{3}{4}$ lbs., as compared with $12\frac{1}{4}$ lbs. and 7 lbs. in 1874.

Amount of Revenue from licence duties in 1875, £347, as compared with £335 in 1874—an increase of £12.

No. 6^3, Kenmare District.

Extending from Crow Head to Lamb Head, in the county Kerry.

This district has been specially favoured in 1875—as the reports received are of the most satisfactory character, the quantity of salmon captured being considerably in excess of the take of 1874.

A glance at page 67, par. 22, Kenmare, will show that a considerable number of convictions have been made during the year for poisoning the streams, &c. It is highly satisfactory to find it possible to secure convictions for offences of this nature—as it was considered formerly next to impossible to do so—and it is to be hoped, that as

the fines inflicted have been of a substantial amount, this abominable habit may be eventually stamped out.

No variation reported as to size of the salmon or peale.

I regret to find a continued decrease in the funds received for licence duties, the amount received for 1875, being only £60 6*s.* 8*d.*, against £72 10*s.* received in 1874. The diminution it will be perceived is in the number of licences issued for salmon rods —the number being in 1875 only 17, whilst in 1874 it was 33.

The artificial propagation of salmon by Richard Mahony, esq., of Dromore Castle, has been continued as usual.

I regret to say, however, that owing to an accidental diversion of the stream, by which the boxes containing the ova were supplied with water, by a man engaged in draining some land through which it passed, nearly all were destroyed.

In 1874 the average weight of salmon was reported as from 7 to 9 lbs.—and peale 5 lbs.

In 1875, salmon from 6 to 12 lbs ; peale 3 to 6 lbs.

The total amount received from all sources for protection is £78 12*s.* 6*d.*, as compared with £72 for last year ; but the former includes a sum of £18 5*s.* 10*d.*, received for fines, &c., during the year.

No. 6², Bantry District.

Extending from Mizen Head to Crow Head, in the county of Cork.

The reports from this District have been favourable. The capture has been greater than last year.

No change reported as to size of the fish.

The Revenue less by £4 than 1874—the amount for 1875 being £48, as compared with £52 in 1874.

No. 6¹, Skibbereen District.

Extending from Galley Head to Mizen Head, both in the county of Cork.

The capture in this district was very nearly half as much again as in 1874.

No change reported as to size of the fish.

Amount available for protection much the same as last year, viz., £59.

No. 5.—Cork District.

Extending from Ballycotton Head to Galley Head in the county of Cork.

The season of 1875, as regards the quantity of fish captured by nets, was exceedingly good, the take being very much more than that of the previous year, which, as may be seen from my report for 1874, was better than had ever before been known in the Cork district.

Since we commenced in 1872 reporting separately on the different districts, I have had the satisfaction of being able year by year to give a good account of this district, as will be seen by the following extracts from previous reports :—

In 1872 "Fishing season very good, as far as the tidal fisheries are concerned ; not so good with regard to single rods."

1873.—"Although 1872 was a remarkably good year for the net men, it is reported that the capture for 1873 was much larger than for many years past.

1874.—"The quantity of salmon captured by nets having been much greater than was ever known in any previous season, and the rod fishing during part of the year was very good."

It is beyond all doubt that the salmon fisheries of the Cork district are steadily improving, and the stock of fish in the rivers during the spawning season has been generally quite sufficient for all purposes.

In regard to the angling—from inquiries which I have made amongst old and experienced fishermen—I believe that in former years it was never by a long way as good as during the last few years ; and this opinion is fully supported by the fact, that the rents for rod fisheries have enormously increased and are still increasing.

One experienced angler informed me that some years ago an angler capturing one fish in a day would be considered to have done very well, but latterly it has not been thought very extraordinary to capture with a single rod five or six, at times even more, of good fresh-run spring fish.

I am very glad to say that at last the long desired fish pass has been constructed over Carrygrohane weir; and although some slight alterations are still to be made in it, I have good reason to believe that it will prove most effective, and contribute much to improve the angling of the river. It has been constructed of concrete upon the site of an old fish pass built many years ago, but which was found to be of very little, if of any use at all.

Great apprehension has been created in the minds of the draft-net men and the anglers of the Lee, by the large increase in the number of drift-nets used this year by fishermen principally from Passage and Queenstown. By the returns in this office, it would appear that this mode of fishing was unknown in the district until the year 1871, when licences were issued for four of these nets. It must be assumed that the fishing could not have been remunerative in that year, as during 1872, '73, and '74 no licences for this kind of engine were applied for; but in 1875 six were issued, and I am informed that this year (1876) no less than eighteen have been taken out.

Applications have been received to prohibit altogether the use of these nets, as it is alleged that when fishing at night they are frequently anchored and used illegally as fixed nets. It is proposed to hold an inquiry on the subject later in the year, when more experience has been gained of their effect upon the fisheries generally. Until this has been done it would be premature to express an opinion on the subject.

During the year, in consequence of very pressing applications for a change of season, public inquiries were held on the subject at the following places :—

At the Court House, Cork, on 20th June, 1875.
Do. Macroom, 22nd do.
Do. Bandon, 24th do.
Do. Timoleague, 26th do.

After very lengthened and careful inquiries it was determined to change the season as follows :—

—	New Close Season.		Old Season.	
	Nets and other Engines.	Single Rods and Lines.	Nets and other Engines.	Single Rods and Lines.
Entire District, save Bandon and Argideen Rivers.	16th August to 14th February.	13th October and 14th February.	16th August and last day of Feb.	1st October and last of February.
Bandon River, . . .	16th August and last day of Feb.			
Argideen „ . . .	1st September and last day of Feb.			

Thus it will be seen that rods and nets are permitted to commence fishing a fortnight earlier than before, whilst there is a curtailment at the end of the rod season of thirteen days in October.

A large proportion of the proprietors and anglers were in favour of this change, but the net men urged very strongly that the season should be opened much earlier.

However, from the tenor of their evidence, it would appear to be of little consequence to the latter how the close season is arranged, as many of them allege that they carry on illegal fishing during the close season in the month of January and February, notwithstanding the presence of a gun boat and the efforts of the water bailiffs to enforce the fishery laws.

I must say for myself that although I have little doubt about their inclination to fish in the close time, I am convinced that their operations have been much interfered with by the presence of the gun boat and by the action of the bailiffs.

I have in my reports for 1873 and 1874 commented upon the illegal netting carried on in the tidal parts of the River Lee, to the determined character and bearing of the poachers, and to the steps taken by this department to aid in putting a stop to their depredations.

A gun boat was therefore again applied for for the past close season, and was stationed for a short time in the tideway. During the time she was there she was of great value, and did much to suppress illegal fishing, but unfortunately she could only be spared from the latter part of December last until the end of January, as her services were required for other duties.

The Cork Anglers' Club still persevere in their efforts to improve the fisheries of the Lee, both by their subscriptions and their efforts to suppress poaching, in both of which they have rendered valuable aid.

It is reported that the size of the fish was about the same as in 1874, but some fish of exceptionally large size were captured, one weighing 38 lbs.

The amount received for licence duties in 1875 was £570, as compared with £508 in 1874, besides which other payments, such as fines, &c., amounting to £61 15*s.* 1*d.*, have increased the amount available for protection to £631 15*s.* 1*d.*, a large sum, but still quite insufficient for the requirements of the district.

No. 4.—Lismore District.

Extending from Ballycotton, in the county of Cork, to Helvick Head in the county of Waterford.

I regret that I cannot make as good a report of the Fisheries of the Lismore District as of the others situated more to the west; still I have no reason to believe that the district is retrograding, but, that like the generality of the salmon fisheries elsewhere, it has suffered from the unusual dryness of the season.

In my last report I referred to an important bye-law intended to regulate the drift-net fishing in this district. I am glad to say, having since received the approval of his Grace the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council, it has become law; and I anticipate favourable results from its enforcement, which, no doubt, will be attended with trouble for some time.

During the year the following change was made in the close season, as regards single rods and lines :—

Old close season, 1st October to 31st January.
New close season, 13th October and 14th February.

The effect being to close the first 13 days in February and to open the first 13 days in October.

I must confess that it was with some reluctance I recommended this season for adoption by my colleagues; and it was only as a concession to the upper proprietors and anglers generally (upon whom so much depends), that I consented to it; as, after long consideration, I am inclined to believe that, as far as possible, and with very rare exceptions, the month of October ought, in the interests of the fisheries, to be a close month.

Some exceedingly fine fish have been captured this season; some from 36 to 42 lbs. in weight; but the average weight all round is about the same as last year.

The total amount received during the year, and available for protection is £802 10*s.*, as compared with £777 10*s.* in 1874, an increase over the latter year of £25; besides which there is a sum of £100 8*s.*, received for fines and sales of forfeited engines.

No. 3—Waterford District.

Extending from Helvick Head, in the county of Waterford, to Kiln Bay, in the county of Wexford.

The capture in this district has been less than in 1874; the decrease has been attributed to the dryness of 1875. In all other respects the condition of affairs appears to be highly satisfactory.

Amount available for protection, £1,245, of this £1,162 is the amount received for licence duties; and £83 for fines, &c. Total amount received for 1874, £1,180.

A considerable increase is reported in the average size of salmon, and the peale are reported to average from 5 to 8 lbs. In 1874, 4 to 8 lbs.

No. 2.—Wexford District.

Extending from Wicklow Head, in the county of Wicklow, to Kiln Bay, east of Bannow Bay, in the county of Wexford.

The fishing throughout the district was not as good as in 1874, in consequence of the excessive dryness of the season. This was evidently the cause, for in the lower waters near the sea, where there is greater depth, considerable quantities of fish were taken, whereas in the fisheries higher up not so much affected by the tides, the takes were considerably less than usual.

It is reported that there has been a great increase in the average size of spring salmon, which is given as 18 lbs. In 1874 it was 14 lbs. Peale the same in each year, viz., 5 lbs.

Amount received for licence duties in 1875, £257, slightly over that for 1874; but other receipts, such as fines, &c., brings the amount available for protection £291 11*s.* 8*d.*

Concluding Observations.

The season of 1875, as regards the extreme southerly and westerly districts of the division under my supervision, has been generally prosperous. I regret that I am not enabled to report so favourably of the Lismore, Waterford, and Wexford districts, which appear, like most of the salmon fisheries of the kingdom, to have suffered considerably from the unusual dryness of the season; but as the quantity of breeding stock in the streams has been satisfactory, and as more interest from year to year is being taken in preservation, I look forward with confidence to increased production in the future.

From time to time in previous reports I have drawn attention to the insufficiency of funds to provide for protection during the spawning season. At present they are not half protected as they deserve to be, and unless we can secure more thorough care I am not hopeful that any further general improvement in the produce of our salmon fisheries will take place.

A great deal may be done by a revision of the licence duties, as under the present rates as fixed by statute I do not consider they produce nearly as much as they ought to do—several of the engines used in large numbers being too lightly taxed.

In 1848 the Act 11th and 12th Vic., c. 92, was passed. Under this Boards of Conservators were first formed, and certain licence duties fixed, the maximum charge on each kind of engine not to exceed the following:—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
Single salmon rods,	1	0	0
Cross lines and rods,	2	0	0
Snap nets,	1	10	0
Draft nets or seines,	3	0	0
Drift nets,	3	0	0
Trammel nets for pollen,	1	10	0
Pole nets,	2	0	0
Bag nets,	5	0	0
Fly nets,	5	0	0
Stake nets or stake weirs (Scotch),	15	0	0
Head weir,	6	0	0
For every box, crib, or cruive, or drum net,	5	0	0
Gap, eye, or basket for eels,	1	0	0

After fifteen years' experience it was found to be necessary to increase the maximum rate upon certain engines; and by the Act 26th and 27th Vic., chap. 116, which was passed in 1863, the following changes were made:—

Licence duty on bag nets increased from £5 to £10; fly nets from £5 to £30; stake nets, or stake weirs, Scotch, from £15 to £30; for every box, crib, or cruive from £5 to £10. Thirteen years have elapsed since this change was made, and I consider that the time has come when a further change might fairly be made.

The drift and draft nets generally are far too lightly taxed for their powers of capture. I do not say that they are invariably so; but when it is known that in some cases the latter, at a single draft of the net, will take fish by the hundred, it is evident that a higher rate of duty might fairly be assessed.

When we came into office in 1868, we found that single rod licences in thirteen districts were issued at 10*s.* per rod, and in the remaining eight districts at £1. They are now, and have been for some time issued at the maximum rate of £1 throughout Ireland, which is, in my opinion, a fair rate; but as compared with a £3 licence for a drift or a draft net, or 30*s.* licence for a snap net, quite too high.

Fixing a higher maximum rate of licence duty upon certain engines (which can only be done by Act of Parliament) would not necessarily lead to an increase upon any particular engine, unless the peculiar circumstances prevailing in a locality would justify it. The Act itself would only provide that certain engines should not be taxed at a higher rate than that specified, leaving it to Boards of Conservators to say what the proper amount (not exceeding that fixed by the Act) should be; and the Conservators, by the fact of their residence in the localities, should be in a position to know what would be

fair and just; but even when a rate has been so fixed by them, it does not become operative until sanctioned by the Inspectors.

My belief is that if revised, and a satisfactory maximum scale arranged, it would lead to an increase in the funds of from £1,200 to £2,000 a year, a very important addition to the present amounts received.

Another most important element in the best means of improving our fisheries, is to secure the more active supervision of the Constabulary. In some localities they render very valuable assistance as it is; but this should be general wherever their stations are so situated as to enable them to give attention to the preservation of the rivers, without neglecting their other duties.

The valuation of the fisheries is still almost generally neglected, and I fear will continue to be so, until power is given to this department to enforce the provisions of the Acts relating thereto. It is almost too much to expect proprietors of fisheries to tax themselves, and in leaving this duty with the Conservators it is practically doing so, many members of the various Boards being owners of valuable rod and net fisheries.

JOS. HAYES.

All of which we certify to your Grace,

We have the honour to be,

Your Grace's obedient servants,

J. ALOYSIUS BLAKE.
THOMAS F. BRADY.
JOS. HAYES.

ALAN HORNSBY, *Secretary.*

Office of Irish Fisheries,
12, *Ely-place, Dublin,*
31*st July,* 1876.

APPENDIX.

Appendix No.		Page
1.	State of the Registry of Fishing Vessels on the Coast of Ireland, from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876,	30
2.	Return of Boats registered by the Collectors of Customs,	45
3.	Abstract of Returns from Coast Guard,	46
4.	Howth Herring Fishing for Season 1875,	47
5.	Ardglass Herring Fishing for Season 1875,	47
6.	Returns of Kilkeel, Arklow, Omeath and Warrenpoint, and Greenore Herring Fishing; Arklow Oyster Fishing; and Deliveries of Salmon and Grilse at Billingsgate, London, 1875,	47
7.	Return of Fish exported to England, consigned from Irish Fisheries in 1875,	50
8.	Return of Fish brought into Courtown Harbour, 1875,	50
9.	Returns of Fish conveyed by the different Railway and Steam Packet Companies, for the year ending 31st December, 1875, and of Kinsale Mackerel Fishery,	50
10.	Abstract of Statements from Boards of Conservators,	60
11.	List of Stone Weirs used for Salmon Fishing, with their Breadth, and the size of the Queen's Gap or Share maintained therein respectively,	69
12.	Table showing the Close Seasons for Salmon and Trout in the different Districts in Ireland,	70
13.	Schedule of Licence Duties payable in each District on Engines used for Fishing for Salmon, January, 1875,	72
14.	Schedule of Licence Duties received by the Boards of Conservators for the Years 1874 and 1875,	72
15.	Amount of Licence Duty received for the different Fishing Engines for the Year 1875, in each District,	74
16.	Table showing the Total amount realized, and the increase and decrease in the amounts received in the various Districts, from the sale of Licences between 1863 and 1875,	75
17.	List of Rivers, the Mouths of which have been defined,	75
18.	By-laws, Orders, &c., made by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, up to 31st March, 1876,	76
19.	Abstract of By-laws, Orders, &c., in force on 1st January, 1876, relating to the Fisheries of Ireland,	78
20.	Summary of Certificates for Fixed Engines, issued by the late Special Commissioners and the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries,	82
21.	Rivers, the Tidal and Fresh Water Boundaries of which have been defined,	82
22.	List of Licences granted to Plant Oyster Beds, up to 31st December, 1875,	83
23.	Abstract of Replies to Queries received from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds,	85
24.	Rules for the Administration of Irish Reproductive Loan Fund, approved by His Grace the Lord Lieutenant in Council,	99
25.	Table showing Loans advanced in the various Counties under the Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act (1874), for the Year 1875,	99
26.	Result of Inquiries held by Special Commissioners and the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, into the Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland,	100
27.	Certificates granted up to 31st December, 1875, for Fixed Engines for fishing for Salmon or Trout, 1875,	110

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COA

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Bo
1	Dublin,	Howth to Greystones,	J. F. Lenon, Commander, R.N.	99	401	90	62	201	9	46	154	21	207	756	12
2	Arklow,	From the breaches three miles north of Five-mile-point Station, county Wicklow, to the sluices three miles south of Cahore Station, county Wexford.	C. C. Rising, Commander, R.N.	5	28	3	299	1,734	21	57	230	5	361	1,992	
3	Wexford,	Morris Castle to Bannow, county Waterford.	Henry E. Stephens, Commander, R.N.	–	–	–	108	471	–	43	174	5	151	645	
4	Waterford,	From East Bank of Bannow Ferry, co. Wexford, to Ballyvoile Head, north of Dungarvan Harbour, county Waterford.	H. W. Rochfort, Commander, R.N.	8	24	8	108	326	2	36	53	–	152	403	

. 1.

IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards, and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
ssels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
215	806	121	–	–	–	8	50	1	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving. Herrings, cod, and soles most largely captured. No increase in any kind of fish appearing off coast of division. Considers herrings and whiting are keeping further out to sea than formerly; and that fishermen have suitable craft and gear. One curing establishment at Howth, where curing carried on during winter months fairly successful. Not much curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts between either fishermen themselves, or fishermen and others—fishermen generally orderly. No spirit of emigration amongst fishermen. Farming not combined with fishing. Modes of fishing practised, viz., drift nets for herrings, and trawlers; no increase in latter. Good trawling ground inside and outside the "banks" of this division, and much availed of weather permitting. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good, and rates moderate, but no improvement during past year. Large shoals of herrings appeared some 15 to 20 miles off coast of division during summer months, and nearer in winter. Means of capture adequate. No public oyster fisheries in division. Grounds duly stocked where licences granted for the establishment of private oyster beds; quality of oysters good, realizing from 10*s.* to 11*s.* per hundred. Probable amount obtained by sales during the year from £5,000 to £6,000. No scollops found on coast of division. No lobster or crab fisheries in division. States that the development of the Irish fishing fleet at Howth is stunted by the want of men to man the boats, and that an importation of labour would be beneficial; that as long as the men are able-bodied their proficiency in seamanship is a secondary consideration, also that a pier is much required at Greystones.	1
363	2,024	23	–	–	6	2	32	–	No portion of division unguarded. Weather been too unfavourable for a fair opinion as to state of fisheries. Capture in many places equal to previous three years. Boats as a rule have not been out so often. Herrings, cod, and oysters most largely captured. Not aware of any great increase in quantity of any kind of fish appearing. Boats had fair catches in favourable weather. Considers the distance the fish keep out to sea entirely owing to the state of the weather; that in bad they keep in deep water, and necessarily further out, but come in during fine weather. That this year they have generally kept further out than formerly. States that considering the small depths of water to each little harbour owing to silting and bars and general neglect of any kind of dredging or clearing, fishermen have suitable craft and gear, but that if the depths were greater the boats as a rule would be too small for profitable or continuous fishing. No curing establishments in division, but a considerable quantity of fish cured by individual fishermen in plentiful seasons, both for own consumption and retail. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing—fishermen generally orderly, but rather addicted to drink at Arklow and Courtown. Emigration not now prevailing. Fishermen, generally, would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They generally combine farming with fishing, except at Arklow where there is so large a fishing population and boats, &c., better that very few farm. Modes of fishing practised—herring nets, cod lines, oyster dredging, and trawling. No increase in trawlers. Good trawling ground from Arklow to Cahore, but not much used. Boats too small. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good, but no improvement during past year. States one large shoal of herrings appeared on 16th November. Fair means for capture, but weather broke and not many were caught considering the numbers individual boats took that day. Herrings and cod appeared in May and November at from half to 7 miles from shore, according to weather. No sun fish or basking shark seen. Public oyster fisheries situated between Kilmichael and Wexford. Supply improving. Spatting rather better than previous year. One new oyster bank discovered near Blackwater Bank lightship. Considers it quite possible oyster banks may exist between Arklow and Cahore, but enterprise wanting, men preferring to fish where they know a bank exists than go in search. No steps necessary to have them availed of. No private oyster beds. Quality of oyster good from public beds; price from 18*s.* to 25*s.* per barrel. Courtown usually commands the best price. Amount realized by sale of oysters about £9,803, viz.: Arklow, £9,433, Courtown, £300, Cahore, £70. Scollops not found. State of lobster and crab fisheries moderate; only two or three men practise it. Fish about the same. Not many small sized of either species taken, there being no market for them. No limit as to size that should be taken necessary. Suggests for the benefit of the fisheries that one or two harbours should be available for large boats at all half tides, or at least *with certainty every* high tide, Arklow and Wicklow being the only available ones in division, and boats at sign of bad weather have to leave their ground to make sure of their harbour. States that four men were drowned at Arklow this year, from waiting too long and not being able to get into port. That larger boats would be more serviceable, and help might be given to deserving men to purchase and fit out same.	2
226	779	31	–	–	–	75	134	26	No portion of division unguarded. No improvement in the fisheries. Cod, herrings, soles, mackerel, and pollock, most largely captured. No increase in any kind of fish appearing off coast of division. Considers mackerel are keeping further out to sea than formerly, and that fishermen have not suitable craft and gear. No curing establishments in division, nor much curing by individual fishermen, as they generally sell the fish at once. No conflicts between either fishermen themselves, or fishermen and others; fishermen generally orderly. A spirit of emigration prevailing; but considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. Farming generally combined with fishing. Modes of capture practised—nets, trawling, and hand line fishing. No increase in trawlers. Good trawling in the north and south bay of Wexford, but nowhere else; much availed of in fine and moderate weather. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good, charges moderate, same as last year. Large shoals of mackerel and herrings appeared off coast of division for which there were moderately adequate means of capture; mackerel from July till September, herrings in November, at about one mile from shore. Public oyster beds exist between Cahore Point North, and Ballyvaldon South. Fishermen state they are improving. Spatting better than previous year. No new natural banks lately discovered. Does not consider there are any banks in division unworked. No steps taken to stock ground where licences granted for the establishment of private oyster beds. Quality of oysters from public beds good; price from 18*s.* to 20*s.* per barrel. Cannot ascertain amount realized by sale during year. No scollops found. Lobster and crab fisheries not improving—much small sized of both species sent to market. Considers it would be desirable to limit size of lobster that should be taken, that they can only be captured in this division during four months in the year. States fishermen as a rule have not sufficient means to purchase good boats and nets, and that it would be very desirable to have a quay for boats built at Carnsore.	3
196	602	19	–	–	–	44	199	9	No portion of coast of division unguarded, but some parts of the rivers of fishery district to which it belongs being beyond the limits of the division are unguarded, viz., Feathard station for four miles up River Barrow; Arthurstown station, River Suir, for eighteen miles, from Ballyhack, county Wexford, to Glasshouse, county Kilkenny; and both sides of River Barrow to Fishertown, county Wexford, on one side, and Rochestown, county Kilkenny on the other, but always visited by the coastguard officers of the stations to which they belong for the purpose of collecting statistics for annual report, or as occasion may require. No improvement in fisheries. Plaice, mackerel, salmon, peel, cod, soles, brit, turbot, slade, and sprat, most largely captured. No great increase in any kind of fish appearing. Does not consider fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly. States as a rule fishermen have suitable craft and gear. No curing establishment in division, nor much curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts—fishermen generally very orderly. No spirit of emigration amongst fishermen. Considers they would be likely to prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. That fishermen in all cases combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—hand lines, trawling, drift nets, long line, spillers, seines, and sprat nets. No increase in trawlers. That trawling ground exists in Baginbun bay for small boats—not much availed of. Good trawling ground fourteen miles S.E. from Dunmore, and much availed of. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good and charges moderate, but no improvement during past year. States large shoals of mackerel and sprats appeared off coast at Ballymaeow close to shore in early part of September. Shoals of mackerel off Tramore in August at from one to two miles from shore, and at Bonmahon a few shoals of fish during summer months at about half a mile from shore, but no adequate means for any of their capture. States public oyster banks exist between the Bar and Duncannon in the Waterford river. Not improving. Spatting worse than previous year. No new banks lately discovered. Does not think there are any unworked. No steps	4

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COA

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boy
5	Youghal,	From Ballyvoile Bridge, county Waterford, to Garryvoe (in Ballycotton Bay), county Cork.	P. R. H. Parker, Commander, R.N.	5	27	2	71	259	18	39	239	1	115	525	2
6	Queenstown,	From Garryvoe (in Ballycotton Bay), westward to Lane's Cottage at Ringabella Point, including Queenstown Harbour, county Cork.	H. T. Price, Commander, R.N.	6	27	1	98	362	13	26	87	18	130	476	3
7	Kinsale,	From Myrtleville Point East, to Galley Head West, county Cork.	J. G. Warren, Commander, R.N.	44	305	38	126	486	12	200	890	83	370	1,681	133

No. 1—*continued.*

of Ireland from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
									taken to stock ground where licences granted for the establishment of private beds. Quality of oysters good; privately sold, fishermen generally get from 8*s.* to 15*s.* per hundred. Could not ascertain amount realized by sales during the year. Scollops not found. As a general rule lobster or crab fisheries not improving. Not much small fish of either species sent to market. Does not think it would be desirable to limit the size that should be taken, or prohibit capture altogether for any portion of year.	
172	729	22	–	–	–	57	204	1	Coast of division unguarded from Roman Catholic Chapel, Abbeyside, to Killingford Bridge, 3½ miles. Mine Head to Corrin River, 6¾ miles. Great Island to Ferry Point, Blackwater River, 5¼ miles; and from Glanwilliam to Ballycrenane, 5 miles. Total, 20½ miles. Fisheries not improving. Salmon, hake, and sprats most largely captured. A slight increase in quantity of hake appearing off coast of division. Considers so far as herrings and mackerel are concerned that they are keeping further out to sea than formerly, but not other fish. States fishermen have not suitable craft and gear for capture of fish frequenting coast of division. That Mr. Acres of Youghal has a small curing establishment, but supply of fish not enough to keep it at work continuously. A small amount of curing by individual fishermen for home consumption. No disturbances between fishermen themselves, or fishermen and others. Fishermen very orderly. Not much emigration prevailing. Fishermen generally combine farming and fishing. Modes of fishing practised—hand lines, trammels, and drift nets. Trawling not increased. Good trawling ground along the coast of division, but not much availed of, fish being scarce. Means of transit of fish to market for sale, from Youghal good, and rates moderate. No improvement during the past year. No large shoals of fish appeared off coast of division during past year. No public oyster banks in division. States Mr. Kendall, who was granted a licence in Dungarvan Bay, has established a private oyster bed. No oysters sent to market. No scollops found on coast of division. A few crabs and lobsters taken in Dungarvan Bay, and at Ardmore, but they are not in the market as a general rule. Fishery so small does not think it desirable to regulate it. Has no suggestions to offer.	5
152	521	33	–	–	–	22	45	1	No portion of coast of division unguarded—but from Ringaskiddy up the Lee not guarded by coastguard. The boats of upper waters registered at custom-houses, Cork and Queenstown. Fisheries not improving. Bream, cod, ling, hake, conger, plaice, sole, scad, and sprats most largely captured. No increase in any kind of fish appearing off coast of division. States all descriptions of fish kept off the coast this year; that in some cases fishermen have suitable craft and gear, and in other not. No curing establishments. No curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen generally orderly. A spirit of emigration prevailing, but considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home if adequately rewarded for their labour, but that they seem to say the fishing is falling off every year. Farming generally combined with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—trammel nets, seines, long lines, hand lines, and trawling. Trawling carried on outside Roche's Point, and sometimes in the different parts of the harbour (Cork). Trawlers state their capture not near so good as in former years. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good, but no improvement during past year. No shoals of any kind of fish appeared off coast during past year. States public oyster fisheries exist at East Ferry, Brown Island, in the Midleton River, and up the Lee; not improving at former places. Spatting worse than previous year. No new banks discovered. Does not consider there are any unworked. States steps have been taken to cultivate ground where licences granted for the formation of private oyster beds. Quality of oysters good. Price, 10*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales about £500. A few scollops found, and very good about East Ferry. No lobsters or crabs found. Suggests that if a camber or mole was made at Ballycotton it would shelter the boats, it being the principal place for fishing in division.	6
400	1,739	149	–	–	–	30	58	16	Coast unguarded between Flat Head and Barry's Head, east of Oyster Haven, about three miles in extent. With the exception of mackerel, fisheries not improving. Cod, ling, and hake have been few and far between, particularly off Kinsale. Mackerel and herring most largely captured. The number of boats engaged in the former increasing every year, and last year about forty Scotch and Irish boats tried the herring fishing, with moderate success. An increase in mackerel and "bog fish." Complaints general all along coast of division, that the latter have increased to such an extent that at times nothing else is taken. Fishermen say that codling is keeping further out to sea than formerly, but considers it doubtful; thinks if there be any truth in their report it may be accounted for by the "dog fish" having increased so much that other fish are driven away. Kinsale craft suitable and well fitted and found, also a few boats at Courtmacsherry, but nowhere else have fishermen either gear or boats suitable for fishing except in the very finest weather. No curing establishment in division, but Courtmacsherry fishermen cure small quantities for their own use; and one buyer in Kinsale cured several thousand hake this year for sale. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen generally orderly. No emigration this year, in consequence of numbers returning from America. Fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. Except at Kinsale, nearly all combine farming and fishing, and are, as a rule, not successful at either. Modes of fishing practised—drift nets, long lines, hand lines, (for hake) spillers, trammels, trawling, and a few seines. No increase in trawlers—four at Kinsale and two at Courtmacsherry. Fair trawling ground off Kinsale, Courtmacsherry, and Clonakilty Bays. Trawling not successful this year. Means of transit of fish to market for sale, during mackerel season good. The larger portion shipped on board steamers and fast cutters for Holyhead and Milford, and remainder by railway or common car to Cork. (The carmen charge about 20*s.* for taking four boxes to Cork.) That facilities offered by railway even during height of the season cannot be relied on, and to make matters worse the station is on the top of a hill, which adds greatly to the cost of transit, the carmen charging what they like for half an hour's work. After buyers go elsewhere. Selling and transit as bad as it is possible to imagine. No improvement in means of transit during past year. Herrings, mackerel, and pilchards appeared in large shoals. Means adequate for their capture at Kinsale, but nowhere else along coast of division. Pilchards and herrings appeared in June, and were taken from 1 to 12 miles off shore. Mackerel in February, and captured from 7 to 40 miles off shore. Cod and ling in November. States public oyster banks exist in Bandon River and Kinsale Harbour—not improving. Considers if steps not taken to preserve Kinsale oyster beds they will soon be extinct. Has no information as to spatting. No new natural banks lately discovered. Thinks it quite possible there are some oyster banks in division unworked. Considers it would be well to offer a small reward to any fisherman who discovered a new bank. No steps whatever taken to stock ground granted for the establishment of private oyster beds. Quality of oysters very fine; price, 7*s.* to 8*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales not known. States that having personally communicated with the men engaged dredging for oysters, they are one and all agreed that the only hope of saving the Kinsale oyster beds would be to close the fishing for three years, that they have hardly realized enough this year to pay their expenses. No scollops found. Lobsters and crabs becoming more scarce every year; both large and small taken. Is decidedly of opinion it would be most desirable to have a limit placed on the size that should be sent to market; that it would be difficult to prohibit capture for a portion of the year, as the fishing can only be carried on in fine weather. States the facilities offered to fishing vessels coming into Kinsale with a large catch of fish to dispose of are very bad, there being no deep-water pier to come alongside, nor no comfortable mooring place—that in fact, the buying, selling, packing, and shipping of the fish during the mackerel season is carried on in the roughest and most uncomfortable manner. That the construction of a large fishery pier would be of great advantage to all parties—the fishermen would have a place to moor their boats, the owners to sell their fish by auction, and not be as they are now at the mercy of their men and the buyers. That it would also benefit the latter, by saving the expense of keeping a boat and men, in which they (the buyers) go out to bargain with the incoming boats, and also the expense of hulks, lighters, &c.; and that finally, if a pier was constructed and connected by rail unbroken to Dublin, and the Company to give liberal facilities for transit, considers the Kinsale mackerel fishery would increase beyond all calculation. Considers that oyster beds should be periodically closed, and a fund formed for paying for the laying of spat, by each boat having to pay for a licence.	7

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
8	Skibbereen,	From Galley Head to Snave Bridge at the head of Bantry Bay, county Cork.	John S. Keats, Commander, R.N.	7	39	4	77	307	27	253	699	32	337	1,045	63
9	Castletown Berehaven.	From Snave Bridge, county Cork, to Kenmare Bridge, county Kerry.	W. I. B. Ogilvy, Lieutenant, R.N.	1	4	–	22	88	–	17	612	–	201	704	–
10	Killarney,	From Kenmare (S.), to Blennerville Bridge (N.), county Kerry.	P. Mahony, Divisional Officer.	11	40	9	117	649	–	160	777	4	288	1,466	13
11	Ballyheigue,	From Blennerville Bridge, Tralee (S.W.), county Kerry, to Foynes Island (E.), county Limerick.	W. Daish, Divisional Officer.	1	3	–	37	105	–	72	211	–	110	319	–

No. 1—*continued.*

f IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
294	1,230	–	43	–	63	–	185	–	Coast of division unguarded—1. From League Point, Bantry Bay, to Snave Bridge, including Whiddy Island. 2. Half a mile at Gokane Point from Fahy to Gokane Point. 3. From Rinco Castle to Ballydehob, eight miles. From Altar to Ballyrisode Point, Toormoor Bay, four miles, and eight islands from three to ten miles distant and round Clear Island. From Carberry Island, Dunmanus Bay to League Point, Bantry Bay, fifty miles. 4. From Three Castle Head to Carberry Island, about eight miles. Fisheries not improving. Mackerel, ling, hake, pilchards, plaice, scad, and cod most largely captured. Rather a decrease in quantity of fish appearing off coast of division. Does not consider fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly. That in many of the bays fish are plentiful. States fishermen have suitable craft and gear for capturing some kinds of fish frequenting coast, but not generally for pilchard fishing. No curing establishment. At Milk Cove and Union Hall a good deal of curing done by individual fishermen, and a small quantity about Skull. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen generally very quiet and orderly. Not much emigration amongst fishermen at present. They generally combine farming with fishing; very few depend entirely for their living on fishing. Modes of fishing practised—seines, lines, drift nets, and trammels. A few trawlers to the westward of division, those frequenting eastern part generally from Queenstown. Good trawling ground in Bantry Bay, Roaring Water Bay, Torey Island, Channel, Toormoor Bay, and at back of Sherkin Island, but very little availed of. Means of transit of fish for sale not good; distances from markets great, and fishermen have to depend on hired cars for which they have to pay at a high rate. No improvement during the past year. States that about Skull, Union Hall, and Baltimore, large shoals of fish were seen, principally pilchards and mackerel. Generally sufficient means for capturing mackerel, but not the pilchards; that they appeared from July to end of September, and most frequently seen at about from two to five miles from the coast. A few oysters found on the bank known as Collatran in the River Ilen; not improving; none others; quality of those taken fair; price 7*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales about £4 about Baltimore from the Collatran Bank. Scollops from the eastward of the old coastguard station, Bantry, to the East Point at Whiddy Island, and also in the River Ilen in the winter months. Lobster and crab fisheries very good—a great quantity captured all along the coast of division and sent to the English markets by vessels specially employed for the purpose. No small fish taken. Generally improving. Considers it would not be desirable to limit size that should be taken; that weather prevents the fishing during the winter months. States that fishermen are generally deficient in means and energy, that they are willing to capture the fish if they approach very close to the shore; is doubtful if fishermen had adequate means whether they would take the trouble to go any distance from shore.	8
170	730	4	31	–	–	–	26	4	A great part of division unguarded, viz.:—From Ardgroom to Kenmare Suspension Bridge, and from Curryglass to Snave Bridge, Bantry Bay, and the Dursey Island, unapproachable in bad weather. Fisheries improving. Mackerel, pilchard, ling, hake, and all sorts of flat fish most largely captured. A large quantity of mackerel and ling captured in Kenmare river during spring and early summer. Scarcely any fish taken in Bantry Bay. An increase in pilchards and mackerel. Considers pilchards, mackerel, and herrings, are keeping further out to sea than formerly. States fishermen have not suitable craft and gear. No curing establishments; a few of the Bantry fishermen attempt curing in cellars. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen generally orderly. Emigration dying out. Fishermen almost invariably combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—hand lines, spillers, seines, and herring nets. One trawler, and one was wrecked on Whiddy Island. Very good trawling ground in Bantry Bay. Means of transit of fish to market for sale from Bantry, fair; rates moderate, but from other places no adequate means. No improvement during past year. States large shoals of mackerel appeared off coast of division, and in Kenmare river—but no adequate means for capture—during spring; close to shore. Very little fish seen in Bantry Bay. Private oyster beds at Glengarriffe, Waterfall, Adrigoole, Castletown, and Ardgroom; believes not improving. Cannot state as to spatting whether better or worse than previous year. No new natural banks lately discovered. Considers oyster fisheries "Mill Cove Waterfall" might be advantageously worked if a lease was taken. Is doubtful whether any steps have been taken to stock private beds. Quality of oysters good; price not known. Is not aware of any sale being made. A few scollops found during autumn. Lobster and crab fisheries not improving, those captured of a good size, but considers fishing would be improved if fishing was not allowed before April or May, and closed in November or December. States that if a market could be established and better means of transit available, the fisheries would be greatly improved, and that if fishermen could be persuaded to follow pilchards, the fishery would rival Cornwall in that particular branch. Further states two sun fish were seen off the Dursey Island, but no means for capture, and fishermen considered them not worth the trouble of catching.	9
342	1,695	18	–	–	–	54	229	5	Coast of division unguarded on north shore of Castlemaine harbour from Inch to Castlemaine Bridge, about fourteen miles; from Slea Head to Clogher Head, including the Blasket Islands, about eight miles; and from Brandon Creek to Blennerville Bridge, including the Magharees, about 34 miles. Fisheries not improving. Sole, brit, turbot, plaice, cod, ling, hake, scad, pollock, mackerel, herrings, and pilchards, most largely captured. States this has been the worst season for fish, generally, for many years. Pilchards met with in large quantities. It is the prevailing opinion that cod and ling are keeping further out to sea than formerly. Craft and gear perceptibly improved, but plenty of room for more improvement. No curing establishments; anything in the way of curing done by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen very orderly. Little or no emigration. Farming and fishing generally combined, except at Port Magee, and Dingle. Modes of fishing practised—seines, trammel nets for mackerel and herrings, spillers, hand lines, and trawlers, and increase of one trawler at Dingle. Good trawling ground in Dingle and Ballinskelligs bays, and Kenmare river. Trawling not carried on to the extent it ought. Means of transit of fish to market for sale not good, very expensive; no improvement during past year. States large shoals of pilchards appeared from July to October, but fishermen do not care to fish for them. Fishermen at most stations better provided for capture than previously. That immense shoals of "dog fish" infested all the bays this season to the great annoyance and injury of the poor fishermen who could not cast a net without its being plundered by these depredators, it being a common occurrence for one half the fish in the net to be only head and backbone when taken up, and that even with hand lines half the fish have been eaten while being hauled up. Public oyster banks at Dunkerron and Sneem in Kenmare bay. Slight improvement in former, latter about the same. Spatting about the same as previous year. No new banks discovered. Is unaware that any exist but those named. About 40,000 oysters laid down on private bed at Dunkerron, and Sneem beds have to be stocked every year. Quality of oysters good; price, Dunkerron, 10*s.* 6*d.* per 120; Sneem, 12*s.* to 14*s.* per 120. Dunkerron beds not fished. Amount realized by sales from Sneem beds, £295 11*s.* A few scollops taken at Sneem; from January to March in best condition. Lobsters and crabs taken at Port Magee. Fishing about the same as last year; large and small taken. Fishing so limited would not advise any restriction. Crabs taken, few and inferior, and not worth sending away. Has little to offer as to the benefit of the fisheries. States the same lamentable want of energy prevails amongst the fishermen; meets with instances where one man has had a fair season, while his next-door neighbour is living on credit, which he considers shows the fish are to be had if looked for. Does not know how to induce more industry amongst the fishermen.	10
150	531	2	–	–	–	40	212	2	States the decrease, as compared with last return, in the number of second and third class boats arises from omitting boats engaged exclusively at Tarbert and Cashen in fishing for salmon and that the five first class boats have been done away with this year at Tarbert. Division unguarded, from Spa to Blennerville, five miles; Ballingarry to Menigahane, five miles; and from Leek Castle to Ardmore Head, Ballylongford, twelve miles. States that in Cashen river, the principal salmon fishery, the number captured was in excess of average. Herrings, pilchard, and whiting, generally taken in the deep sea; number this year less than average, that it is generally supposed all kinds of deep sea fish are keeping further off from shore than formerly,	11

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
12	Seafield, .	From Ballymacrievan Point, South, to Lackless Head, North, county Clare.	R. C. Jolliffe, Lieutenant, R.N.	–	–	–	–	–	–	147	441	11	147	441	11
13	Galway, .	From Lackglass Head, county Clare, to Mace Head, county Galway.	James Grant, Commander, R.N.	7	28	7	168	530	19	297	723	10	472	1,281	36
14	Clifden, .	From Mason Island, county Galway, to Dooghbeg, county Mayo.	J. R. Palmer, Commander, R.N.	–	–	–	176	518	4	349	1,382	40	525	1,900	44
15	Keel, . .	Doonbeg Head, East, to Doona Head, West, county Mayo.	Robert Geo. Gibbon, Inspecting Officer.	–	–	–	–	–	–	78	234	17	78	234	17

No. 1—*continued.*

of IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
									and that fishermen have not suitable craft or gear. No curing establishments, or curing by individuals. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen generally very orderly. Emigration prevailing. Thinks fishermen would prefer remaining at home, if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They all combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—nets for salmon, mackerel, and herrings; spillers for ground fish. No trawling. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate. States large shoals of fish appeared off coast, but falling off. No adequate means for capture. That they appeared in July, August, and September, at from ten to twenty-five miles from shore. States public oyster banks exist in Tralee and Clonderlaw bays, Kilcregan, and Tarbert. Some improvement stated at Tarbert and Clonderlaw bay; at Tralee rather a falling-off. Spatting better than previous year in Tralee bay. No new banks discovered. Does not think it likely there are any unworked; that steps have been taken at Barrow by Mr. M'Cowan of Tralee, to stock ground for which he obtained a licence for the establishment of a private bed which is well stocked. Quality of oyster good—price from 4*s.* to 5*s.* per hundred. Difficult to say amount realized by sales, but probably about £1,800. No scollops found. No public lobster or crab fisheries, but from limited trials he has been able to make has no hesitation in saying that lobsters of the finest quality abound on both sides of the promontory of Kerry Head. In conclusion, can only repeat his remarks in the past years' returns. No improvement can possibly take place until the fishermen are provided with the means to enable them to prosecute their calling on the grounds, some distance off the coast, where it is well known the finest fish abound.	
119	336	–	28	105	11	–	–	–	Coast of division unguarded from Cape Creggan to Cancapple, distance about twelve miles. Fisheries not improving. Cod, ling, pilchards, and mackerel most largely captured. No increase in the quantity of any kind of fish appearing. Considers cod and ling in particular are keeping further out to sea than formerly, and that fishermen have suitable craft and gear. No curing establishments in division. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen generally orderly. Emigration not prevailing so much as heretofore. Considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home, if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—nets, lines, and spillers. No good trawling ground in division. Means of transit of fish to market for sale, not good; but rates moderate. No improvement during past year. States large shoals of mackerel and pilchard appeared. That means of capture might be improved by having more nets. Public oyster banks exist between Ballymacrennan Point and Querrin Point. Private oyster beds stocked annually. Quality fair; price from 3*s.* to 6*s.* per hundred. Not more than 20,000 sold. No scollops found. Lobster or crab fisheries not improving. Not much small of either species sent to market. Has no suggestions to offer as to limiting size that should be taken, or prohibiting capture for a portion of year. Suggests if size of oysters to be taken was restricted to two inches, it would be a great benefit.	12
972	2,199	246	–	–	–	500	918	210	Coast of division unguarded, viz.:—Temple Point, Keeraun Point, Davleen Point, Trabaan Point, Aillemore Point, Birmore Point, Mulrea Point, and Roscommon Point—thirty miles; Cammalagh Point to Black Head—seven miles; Muckinish Castle to Kilcolgan Point—twenty-five or twenty-eight miles; Kilmurvey to Bungowlie—three miles; and from Black Rock, West, to Kilcolgan, East—twenty-two miles. Fisheries not improving. Fish most largely captured—cod, ling, pollock, whiting, rock fish, herrings, bream, and hake. An increase in herrings and bream appearing off Ballyvaughan. Considers fish are keeping further out to sea at some places than formerly. That at some parts of division fishermen have suitable craft and gear, and at others not. No curing establishments. Some fish cured by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing—but a conflict occurred between fishermen of the Claddagh, in consequence of their rule that no fishing take place for herrings in Galway Bay, except for three days in the week, having been broken. Fishermen generally very orderly. A spirit of emigration prevailing in some parts of division. Considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—Hand lines, long lines, spillers, nets, and trawlers. Good trawling ground, and much availed of. Means of transit of fish to market for sale—good from some places, and not so from others. No improvement during past year. States large shoals of herrings, mackerel, sprats, and a few pilchards appeared in July, August, and September, but no adequate means for capture. States public oyster banks exist in Tyrone and Kinvara Bay, and S.E. from Deer Island. Supply decreasing. Result of spatting not known. No new banks discovered. Does not think there are any unworked. Cannot say if steps have been taken to stock ground where licences granted for the formation of private oyster beds. Quality of oysters from public beds pretty good. Price, 6*s.* to 7*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sale not known. Scollops found at Lettermullen Island, Kilkeiran Bay, between Glaninagh and Lew Island, and from Barna Quay to Black Head. In best condition in September, October, and December. Lobster and crab fisheries improving. At some places would limit size that should be taken. In conclusion states there are a great many fishermen who would devote all their time to fishing if they had suitable craft and gear, but that they are too poor to purchase such.	13
772	2,099	9	–	–	35	247	199	–	Coast of division unguarded from Mason Island to Fishery Bridge—twenty-one and a half miles; Gurteen Point to Ware Bridge, Ballyconesly—thirteen and a half miles; Silver Hill to Ballinlane—four and a half miles; Slyne Head to Mannin Bay—eight miles; Streamestown to Sellerna Strand—ten miles; Omey, Boffin, and Shark Islands—fifteen miles; Rowa River to Roonagh Point—twenty-three miles; Roonagh Head to Bartrey—fifteen miles; and Dooghbeg to Islandmore—twenty miles; total, 130½ miles. No improvement whatever in the fisheries. No increase in any kind of fish—less appeared than usual. Considers herrings and mackerel are keeping further out to sea than formerly. States fishermen have no boats suitable for deep sea fishing, and very few nets. No curing establishment in division. Fishermen cure for their own consumption. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen generally orderly. A spirit of emigration prevailing amongst fishermen. Does not consider that if they were able to follow fishing pursuits adequately they would prefer remaining at home. They generally combine farming with fishing. Mode of fishing practised—hand lines. No trawlers or trawling ground in division. Means of transit of fish to market for sale—by cart. Rate of carriage moderate to local markets. No improvement during past year. States shoals of herrings and mackerel appeared off coast of division in June and July, from one to four miles from shore, but there were no means for their capture. Public oyster fisheries exist in Newport and Westport Bays. Supply on the decrease. Spatting about the same as previous year. No new natural banks lately discovered. Does not consider there are any in division unworked. States Mr. Kendall, who has obtained a licence to plant a private oyster bed at Westport, has laid down 70,000 oysters, and that Mr. Gunn has bought 400,000 to place on his bed. Quality of oysters good. Prices vary from 3*s.* to 5*s.* and 7*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sale of oysters during past year, £21,675. Scollops found between Innisgort and Innislyre—foul near Clifden—in best condition in July and August. Lobster fishery slightly improving. Crab fishery poor. States great numbers of small lobsters are brought to market and sent to Dublin. Considers it would be desirable to limit the size to be taken, and that from November till April should be close time. Has no suggestions for the benefit of the fisheries to offer.	14
223	414	56	–	–	–	145	180	39	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries much improved. Pollock, horse mackerel, mackerel, bream, and herrings, most largely captured; cod, ling, haddock, whiting, turbot, brit, soles, mullet, and conger also captured. A great increase in horse mackerel, mackerel, and bream. States it is the general opinion of fishermen that fish keep as close to shore as formerly. Boats and gear suitable, and well adapted for capture of fish that come close to shore, but not for capture in deep water. No curing establishment in division, but fishermen cure some for their own use, &c. No conflicts; fishermen generally peaceable and orderly.	15

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
16	Belmullet,	From Doona Point to Butter Point, county Mayo.	T. H. Beddoes, Lieutenant, R.N.	–	–	–	–	–	–	172	478	–	172	478	–
17	Ballycastle (K).	From Brandy Point to Gap of Bartragh Island, county Mayo.	H. S. Mandeville, Lieut., R.N.	–	–	–	1	3	–	137	747	6	138	750	6
18	Pullendiva,	Bartragh Island, county Mayo, to Coney's Island, county Sligo.	R. Bones, Divisional Officer.	–	–	–	–	–	–	47	187	–	47	187	–
19	Sligo,	Strandhill Barracks, co. Sligo, to Donegal Abbey, county Donegal.	F. C. R. Baker, Lieutenant, R.N.	1	5	–	37	155	14	140	632	29	178	792	43

No. 1—*continued.*

of IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
									A spirit of emigration not prevailing at present; feels sure fishermen would prefer remaining at home if employed; they generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing generally practised—nets, hand lines, and spillers. No trawlers. Coast of division not considered good for trawling purposes. Means of transit of fish to market for sale not very bad. Charges moderate. No improvement during past year. States a great many large shoals of horse mackerel, mackerel, and herrings appeared during past year, but too far off coast for capture, fishermen not having suitable gear. That public oyster banks exist in Achill Sound, near Bullsmouth Coast-guard station, getting less in quantity and inferior in quality. Spatting stated to be worse than previous year. No new natural bank lately discovered. Feels sure oyster beds on coast of division are well known and well dredged. No steps taken to stock ground licensed for the establishment of private beds. Price obtained by dredgers about 3*s.* per 120. Amount realized by sale during past year, about £400. No scollops found. That fishermen state lobsters and crabs are so scarce that they are not worth looking after. Has no suggestions to offer for the benefit of the fisheries.	
188	563	–	–	–	–	16	85	–	Coast of division unguarded:—Annagh Head to Elly—eight miles; Geesala to Gootomore and Gootomore to Doona Head—14 miles; Butter Point to Seal Island—ten miles; and the Islands of Inneskea and Davillens, inaccessible, except under very favourable circumstances of weather—eighteen miles. Fisheries slightly improved since loans received. Herring and mackerel most largely captured. No increase in quantity of any kind of fish appearing. Considers fish are not keeping further out to sea than formerly. Craft and gear fairly suitable; fishermen too poor to afford much outlay. No curing establishments. Fishermen appear to cure for their own wants, and sell the surplus. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen very orderly. Spirit of emigration less. States fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately; that farming and fishing are combined in nearly each case. Modes of fishing practised—nets and lines. No trawling, but Blacksod Bay affords good trawling ground. No market for sale of fish, except the small town of Belmullet. Nearest railway forty-one miles distant. Means of transit very slightly improved. States a great many herrings appeared between June and October, about five miles from shore, but there were no adequate means for their capture. That public oyster banks exist in Trawmore Bay and Doolough Creek. Supply falling off. Spatting about the same as previous year. No new natural banks discovered; does not consider there are any unworked. No steps taken to cultivate ground where licences granted for establishment of private beds. Quality very good; price about 6*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales probably between £200 and £300. Scollops found occasionally at Elly. States fishermen do not appear to take any trouble in cultivating lobsters or crabs, the sale of them being uncertain; their number good, but improving. States there is no doubt that the large number of seals in Blacksod Bay must do some damage to fishing. That boats and gear are not altogether adequate for capture of any great amount of fish; that if such boats and gear as are used on the west of England were supplied the success would be greater, but that there is no near market or curing establishment to stimulate the fishermen to any extent.	16
143	682	1	–	68	5	5	–	–	Coast of division unguarded from Brandy Point to Benwee Head—twelve miles; Benwee Head to Timber Cove—seven miles; Folien Cove to Glenlossera River—three miles; Behic Cove to Glenuldra—two miles; total, twenty-four miles. Fisheries not improving. Pollock, glasson, red and gray gurnet, soles, fluke, codling, mackerel, and herrings most largely captured. No increase in quantity of any kind of fish appearing. Considers fish are not keeping further out to sea than formerly. Boats and gear generally bad. No curing establishments, nor curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen generally orderly. A spirit of emigration prevailing; considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately; farming and fishing generally combined. Modes of fishing practised—nets and hand-lines. One trawler belonging to Sir C. K. Gore, bart., but only trawls for his own amusement. Thinks there is good trawling ground along coast of division, especially about Killala and Lacken Bays. Only means of transit of fish to market for sale, by cart along the high-road. No improvement during past year. States large shoals of mackerel and herring appeared in months of July and August, from close to shore to four miles off, but no adequate means of capture. No oyster fisheries. Scollops not found. Only a few lobsters and crabs caught; very few fish for them Considers fisheries would be better worked if there were better boats with good nets and lines.	17
50	262	5	–	–	–	3	75	5	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving. Salmon, herring, and pollock most largely captured. No increase in fish appearing off coast of division. General opinion of fishermen that herrings and mackerel are keeping further out to sea than formerly. States fishermen have not suitable craft and gear for fishing far off coast. No curing establishments or curing by individual fishermen. Two boats at Inniscrone supposed to be maliciously damaged. Fishermen at all other parts very orderly. No spirit of emigration prevailing. Fishermen generally combine farming and fishing, except a few at Inniscrone, who have no land. Modes of fishing practised—nets and lines. No trawlers. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; charges moderate, but no improvement during past year. No large shoals of fish appeared during past year. States public oyster banks exist at Tanrago and in Ballisodare Bay; not improving—dredged out. Spatting last season better than previous. No new banks discovered; does not consider there are any unworked. That oysters bought from fishermen were laid down on ground licensed for private oyster beds at Culleenamore and Tanrago. Quality of oysters very good; general price 10*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales during year not known. Scollops not found. Lobsters supposed to be plenty, but no fishing for them. States landing-place at Inniscrone very much in want of a breakwater or boat harbour. Considers if such was provided, it would benefit fishermen very much.	18
184	731	37	–	61	6	6	–	–	Coast of division unguarded for about sixty-one and a half miles, viz., from Sligo Bridge to Strandhill Barracks, six miles, visited occasionally; Lower Rosses to Drumcliffe Bridge, five miles; Rachley to Cullamore, seven miles, visited weekly; Streedagh to Roskeeragh Point, seven and a half miles, visited weekly; Bunduff to Bundoran, six miles; Ballyshannon to Donegal Abbey, twenty miles, and to Tullaghan, ten miles. No improvement in fisheries—rather the reverse. Oysters, cod, and ling, most largely captured. No great increase of any kind of fish appearing. States it is the fact that fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly; particularly herrings, of which very few have been captured; that boats do not appear to be large enough and suitable for the frequent bad weather which occurs, and that consequently fishermen are not able to go out to the deep water for the deep-sea-line fishing, and always have to run in on the slightest sign of bad weather. No curing establishments, but curing in a small way carried on by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen in general peaceable and orderly. Spirit of emigration not so much as formerly. Considers if fishing improved, fishermen would prefer remaining at home. Nearly all combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—nets and long lines; six trawlers, three at Rachley, and three at Mullaghmore; no increase; only trawl for a few months in the year in Sligo and Mullaghmore bays. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate. No improvement during past year. States no large shoals of fish appeared; that herrings, which used to be plentiful, were scarcely seen. One large public oyster bed in Sligo river; middle of channel constituting bed, with a small channel leading off large one. Supply not improved; Spatting slightly better than previous year. No new natural banks discovered. Considers there are not any unworked. States Mr. Gardiner, Rosses Point, has planted about 130,000 young oysters on his bed at 25*s.* per thousand. Quality of oysters very good; price, 8*s.* to 9*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales about £900. No scollops found. Lobster fishing at Mullaghmore improving. Large and small sent to market; thinks it would be desirable to limit size that should be taken. States an improvement of Rachley Pier would be of great benefit to fishermen there, as a place of refuge for their boats, and also for landing fish at low water, there being no place of refuge in bad weather, and boats are frequently damaged.	19

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
20	Killybegs,	Donegal-quay to Lower Ferry, East, co. Donegal.	Francis Osburn, Lieutenant, R.N.	–	–	–	43	164	21	176	688	89	219	852	110
21	Dunfanaghy,	Gweebarra Bar to Whale Head, Lough Swilly, county Donegal.	E. C. Ball, Nav. Lieutenant, R.N.	–	–	–	81	311	39	133	254	10	214	565	49
22	Carn,	Inch Embankment, Burcrana, county Donegal, to Magilligan Point, south side of Lough Foyle, county Londonderry.	L. M. Malet, Commander, R.N.	6	19	–	277	1,072	10	61	375	1	344	1,466	11
23	Ballycastle (Antrim).	Downhill (N.), co. Londonderry, to Jenny's Bridge (S.), near Cushendall, county Antrim.	Wm. Parsons, Commander, R.N.	2	10	–	113	252	6	33	74	4	148	336	10

No. 1—*continued.*

of IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
247	970	121	–	–	–	28	118	11	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving; falling off. Lobsters, pollock, glasson, whiting, cod, mackerel, and crake herrings, most largely captured. No increase in any kind of fish appearing. Is of opinion the dog fish is keeping other fish away. States fishermen are of opinion that all kinds of fish have abandoned this portion of coast as they are not to be seen as in previous years. Boats not suitable for going any distance from land. Nets not suitable for deep sea fishing. One curing establishment at Teelin, but has been closed for the last seven years. Fish sold in the fresh state. No conflicts; fishermen orderly. Spirit of emigration not prevailing to same extent as formerly. Considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home, if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—nets and lines, two trawlers. Good trawling ground in Donegal Bay; but not much used. Means of transit of fish to market for sale not good. Fish in general sold on the beach to carriers at a reduced price, there being no railway or steamer. No improvement during past year. States no large shoals of fish made their appearance off coast of division, excepting one kind, and that it is important in his opinion to all future fishing, that is the remarkable increase of that most destructive fish, the "dog fish." Alludes most particularly to Donegal Bay, where not only has it increased, but to his knowledge on several occasions, apparently cleared the bay of fish; that the nets are constantly full of them. Fishing for whiting they would follow each fish as hooked, and endeavour to seize it. That in the "Fly" cutter one day, when becalmed, some biscuit being thrown overboard (the water being clear), showed a mass of these fish in such numbers as to blacken the water; that it is well known they destroy all fish, and that they should be destroyed at any cost. Has not observed a similar increase in dog fish in any other part of division. States there have been one or two shoals of small whales, that one struck a boat and ripped the side up, the fishermen escaping in another boat fishing alongside. No public oyster banks nor private oyster bed. No scollops found that he is aware of. Lobsters and crabs more plentiful this year at Malinbeg and Portnoe; medium size; general size caught from nine to twelve inches; would not limit size that should be taken, or prohibit capture during any portion of year (only fished for from September to March). Suggests for benefit of fisheries better boats and gear, and states a steamer at places like Teelin or Donegal would not only protect boats, nets, &c., in bad weather, but would much enhance the market value, by taking the fish to Sligo or other good markets.	20
237	713	65	–	–	–	23	148	16	Coast of division unguarded (Rutland Station), Gwebara Bar to Crown Head, twelve miles. (Gweedore Station)—Old Castle Point to Bremlick, three and a half miles. (Inishboffin Station)—Tory Island, Inishdooey, Inisbeg, Inishboffin, and from Bloody Foreland to Meenaladdy, and from Waterfoot to Horn Head, eleven miles. (Sheephaven Station)—Horn Head to Horn Head Bridge, and from Ards to Lackagh two miles. (Mulroy Station)—Mulroy Coast to Fanet Light, nine miles. (Knockallow Station)—Fanet Light to Benmore, and from Blackrock to Knockallow, two miles. (Rathmullen Station)—Knockallow to Mackamish and Augnish Island to Letterkenny, twelve miles. Fisheries at Sheephaven slightly improved; not any at other stations. Bream, plaice, codling, cod, pollock, sole, whiting, ling, and turbot, most largely captured. An increase in herring, mackerel, whiting, and sole, appearing in June, August, and September. Considers fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly, particularly cod and ling. That fishermen have not suitable craft or gear. No curing establishments. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen industriously disposed. A spirit of emigration generally prevailing. Modes of fishing practised—hand and long lines. No trawlers. Good trawling ground believed to exist off Horn Head in a N.N.E. direction. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good from some stations; not so from others. No improvement during past year. States large shoals of herrings and mackerel appeared in June, August, and September, off Rutland, Sheephaven, and Mulroy Station, but no adequate means of capture existed. No public oyster fisheries. Private oyster beds at Rathmullen all stocked. Price from 7*s.* 6*d.* to 12*s.* per barrel. Amount realized by sales not known. No scollops found. Considers it would be desirable to limit size of lobsters that should be taken; also capture for a portion of year, at some places. In conclusion, states there is no improvement in the fisheries, as fishermen have no means of making provision. Fish generally captured, cod and ling, from December till March, and whiting, pollock, and bream, in season. That herrings were observed in the vicinity of Tory Island during the months of May and June, but that fishermen had no means of capture. Nets too shallow, and fish in deep water. Understands a company has formed a project of sending a fleet of boats in May, 1876, for the capture of herrings and mackerel. Is of opinion they will succeed, that mackerel showed largely during months of August and September, and was captured by hook and lines. No nets in locality fitted for them. That cod and ling, as has been observed by fishermen, are moving seaward each year, and that fishermen have neither craft nor gear for the capture of fish in season; boats too small; nets too shallow.	21
344	1,466	11	–	–	–	–	–	..	Division unguarded—running from east to west. (1) from Down Hill to Magilligan Point, down Lough Foyle to Culmore, south side, and up north side to Roe River, about thirty-three miles; (2) from Port-a-doris to Glenane, about three miles; (3) from Glenane to Glenagiveeney, half a mile; (4) from Mossy Glen to Ballymoghony, 500 yards; (5) from Globe Strand to Culdaff Bridge, about two miles; (6) from Portnamantel to Carrickabeol, three miles; (7) from Carrickabraghy, Isle of Doagh, to Linsfort, east side, Lough Swilly, eighteen miles. Fisheries not improving; generally decreasing at Port Kennegoe. Cod, flat fish, and turbot, most largely captured. No increase in any kind of fish appearing. Considers cod are keeping further out to sea than formerly; other fish about the same. That fishermen have suitable craft and gear, except at Port Kennegoe, Culdaff, Malin Head, and Buncrana. No curing establishments, or curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts of any kind between parties pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen remarkably orderly. States there does not appear to be a spirit of emigration. That a few fishermen have been to sea; that they are a very hardy race, and would prefer fishing, and that most of them combine farming and fishing. Modes of capture practised—long and short lines, herring nets, salmon nets, and trawling. Very fair trawling ground from Down Hill to mouth of Lough Foyle, and in Loughs Foyle and Swilly, availed of as much as possible. No increase in trawlers. Means of transit of fish to market, &c., for sale good, but no improvement during past year. States large shoals of fish appeared off Malin Head, but means of capture inadequate. That public oyster banks exist in Lough Swilly, off Fahan, in Lough Foyle from Magilligan Point to Moville, and off Redcastle and Quigley's Point. Supply decreasing. Cannot say whether spatting better or worse than previous year. No new banks lately discovered. Considers present banks are overworked. No private oyster beds. Quality of oysters good; price 7*s.* to 8*s.* per hundred. Impossible to say amount realized by sales. Has never seen any scollops. Lobster and crab fisheries very fair. Improving at Culdaff and Malin Head. No small-sized sent to market. At present does not consider it desirable to limit capture.	22
155	519	10	–	–	–	7	183	–	States chief officer at Portrush says that out of thirty-two second class boats within the limits of his station, fourteen of them were unemployed during 1875, but that their crews were employed in other fishing boats. Coast of division unguarded from Kinbane Head to Castle Point, 2,400 yards, and from Gob Colliery to Fair Head, 600 yards; total, four and three-quarter miles and forty yards. No change in fishery, much the same as previous year. Glasson or gray fish most largely captured. Some good captures of herring in summer, in Ballycastle bay, and at other parts along coast of division. Ling and cod captured by hand lines, bream and glasson by seine nets. An increase in quantity of herring and gurnet appearing in summer months, but quantity only what fishermen call a few good takes. Considers herrings are not as prolific or plentiful here as on other parts of the coast, for instance, Galway bay, Roundstone, and other bays adjacent. Has heard it advanced as a reason for scarcity of fish on the coast that they are keeping further out to sea than formerly, but has heard nothing in confirmation of the assertion. States several kinds of fish spawn in deep water, for instance, ling, cod, and haddock, spawn on a bank fifteen miles N.E. of Rathlin Island in from thirty to sixty fathoms of water, and that it is supposed by old fishermen that they shift their ground from bank to bank in search of the best and most plentiful feeding spots. Considers fishermen have suitable	23

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
24	Carrickfergus,	Jenning's Bridge, near Carron Point, to White Railings, near Belfast, county Antrim.	A. J. V. Collins, Commander, R.N.	1	4	1	34	80	2	5	19	–	40	103	3
25	Donaghadee,	Tillysburn, near Belfast Lough (S.), co. Antrim, to Newcastle Quay, near Cloghy Bay, co. Down.	R. S. Hunt, Divisional Officer.	20	129	16	67	165	7	5	11	1	92	305	24
26	Strangford, .	Newcastle Quay, North, near Cloghy Bay, to Sheepland Head, South, county Down.	R. Barnes, Divisional Officer.	2	15	2	126	254	6	–	–	–	128	269	8
27	Newcastle, .	Sheepland's Head, Ardglass Station, North, to Kilkeel Foot, Leestone Station, South.	O. Cameron, Commander, R.N.	28	172	10	78	320	17	22	52	2	128	544	29
28	Carlingford, .	From River Foot, Kilkeel, North, county Down, to Maiden Tower, mouth of Boyne, South.	W. G. Gregory, Lieutenant, R.N.	28	187	28	182	814	6	120	310	13	330	1,311	47

No. 1—*continued.*

of IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
									craft and gear. No curing establishment. Fish generally sold in the fresh state. No conflicts of any kind between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen peaceable and orderly in general. No spirit of emigration amongst fishermen. Would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. Farming and fishing generally combined. Many of the young able-bodied men go out on hire as farm labourers, which they find more remunerative than fishing. Remarks that on the exposed unsheltered parts of coast of division, fishing is prevented at times for whole weeks through stress of weather and continued gales of wind with very heavy sea. Modes of fishing practised—seine nets and lines. No trawling; coast not adapted for it. Herrings, bream, and glasson, captured by seine nets; mullet and flat fish by trammel nets. Ling and cod by hand lines. Modes of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate; much the same as previous year. States nothing to call large shoals of fish appeared; that some small shoals of herring, gurnet, and mackerel, were observed from one to two and a half miles off coast. Herrings between July and latter end of August; mackerel much earlier. Some taken, but not any great quantity. No oyster fisheries in division. Scollops not found. No improvement in lobster or crab fisheries; much the same for past three years. A fair quantity captured during their season. No small sized of either species taken. Does not think it would tend to any good to limit size that should be taken. Suggests that loans should be made to poorer class of fishermen; landing slips, &c., repaired; and for the safety of the fishermen, that the rock at "Port in Too," east of Portrush, be blown up, &c.	
43	108	3	–	–	–	3	5	–	States nine second class boats at Carrickfergus were not working for want of men. Coast unguarded from Larne Lightheuse and from Ballylig round Larne Lough, about eight miles. Fisheries not improving. Fish most largely captured—pollock, herring occasionally, and cod. In Belfast Lough, principally cod and flat fish. No increase in quantity appearing. States it is generally thought fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly, especially herrings. That craft and gear appear generally suitable. No curing establishments in district, nor curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen generally orderly. No spirit of emigration prevailing. Fishing so little that very few live entirely by it, except about Carrickfergus. In northern part of division a good many combine farming and fishing on a small scale. Modes of fishing practised—seine nets and long lines. Trawling about Carrickfergus. Good trawling ground in Belfast Lough, but nowhere else, and much availed of. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate, but no improvement during past year. States some shoals of herring and pollock appeared about Glenarm at various times in June, July, and August, about a mile from shore, and occasionally close in, and that nets used appeared adequate. That public oyster banks exist in Belfast Lough; supply as usual. Spatting much as usual. No new natural banks discovered. Does not think there are any unworked. No private oyster beds. Quality of oysters very good. Price about 11*s.* per hundred. Amount realized by sales between £600 and £700. Scollops found in Belfast Lough in winter months. Very few lobsters or crabs caught, and those very small. Thinks probably it would be beneficial to limit size that should be taken. Suggests that loans might be of benefit in places where there is sufficient fishing to induce men to make it their special business as about Belfast Lough.	24
88	298	30	4	7	–	–	–	6	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving. Cod, herring, and pollock, most largely captured. No increase in quantity of fish appearing. Fish not keeping further out to sea than formerly. Craft and gear suitable. No curing establishments, nor curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen very orderly and quiet. No emigration. Farming and fishing generally combined. Modes of fishing generally practised—long and hand lines; a few trawlers, but no increase. Trawling ground good, but of small extent, in Belfast Lough, and only used by local fishermen. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate, but no improvement during past year. No large shoals of fish appeared. One natural oyster bank, extending from Groomsport to the Copeland Islands. Supply not improving. Bank becoming covered with mussels. Spatting much the same as previous year. No new banks discovered. No bank unworked. No licences granted for the establishment of private beds. Quality of oysters good. Price from 10*s.* to 12*s.* per hundred. Unable to state amount realized by sale of oysters, they being taken direct to Belfast. Scollops found off Groomsport, only caught in winter months. Very few lobsters or crabs caught. No improvement. Size small; only caught in winter months. Has no suggestions to offer for benefit of fisheries.	25
127	266	5	1	3	3	–	–	–	No portion of division unguarded. No improvement in fisheries. Herring, whiting, codling, and ling, most largely captured. No increase in quantity of fish appearing. Not known whether fish are keeping further out to sea than formerly. Craft and gear suitable. No curing establishments; but a few fishermen cure for their own consumption. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of fishing. Fishermen remarkably orderly. No emigration. Fishermen prefer remaining at home. They generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—nets, hand and long lines. No trawlers, but trawling ground exists four miles S.E. off Gunn's Islands. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate, but a steady sale in locality. No improvement during past year. No large shoals of fish observed. Herrings appeared from June to August inclusive; pollock, in September and October. Public oyster banks exist between Kircubbin and Ballydoran, Strangford Lough, and from south bay of Tara (north) to Ballyquintin (south), two miles. No improvement in supply. Spatting not better than previous year. No new natural banks lately discovered. All known banks worked. Ground licensed for the establishment of private beds, stocked by men purposely employed. Quality of oysters good; price 60*s.* to 84*s.* per 1,000. About £460 realized by sales. Scollops found on oyster bank, south bay of Tara, in August and September. Lobster and crab fisheries indifferent. Small sized fish of both species sent to market. Capture should be prohibited during July and August.	26
143	627	35	–	–	–	15	83	6	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries much the same as heretofore, except at Ardglass, where more captured, and at Annalong an improvement in herring, cod, whiting, and haddock fishing. No increase in fish appearing, with the exception of herrings, at Ardglass and Annalong; other kinds much the same. Very few mackerel. Fish keeping further out to sea than formerly—chiefly whiting and haddock. Craft and gear suitable. No curing establishments, nor curing by individual fishermen. A few conflicts between fishermen themselves, but as a rule generally orderly. No apparent spirit of emigration; fishermen prefer remaining at home. A few combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing practised—long lines and drift nets; no trawlers. Trawling ground in Dundrum Bay, but prohibited. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good; rates moderate, but no improvement during past year. Very large shoals of herrings observed during July and August, from ten to fifteen miles off coast. Means for capture adequate. No public oyster banks worked. A bank exists about three and a half miles E.S.E. from Annalong Coast-guard station; should be cleared of old shells and relaid; could be advantageously worked. A private bed stocked by Marquess of Downshire at Dundrum, to whom a licence granted. No oysters sold. Scollops not found. No improvement in lobster or crab fisheries. Few taken. No small size sent to market. It might be desirable to limit size that should be taken. Suggests for the benefit of the fisheries that a good safe harbour be made at Newcastle by repairing the pier, at present in a very bad state; as also the harbours of Ardglass and Annalong should be greatly improved.	27
426	1,672	37	–	–	10	96	361	–	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving, except at Carlingford. Cod, whiting, herrings, mackerel, plaice, oysters, lobsters, and crabs most largely captured. No increase in fish appearing, except of herrings off Carlingford. States fishermen consider fish are keeping further out to sea at some places than formerly. That in some parts gear is suitable, and in others not. No curing establishments, nor curing by individual fishermen. No conflicts—fishermen generally orderly. No spirit of emigration in some parts of division, and on the decrease in others; considers fishermen would prefer remaining at home if able to follow fishing pursuits adequately. They generally combine farming with fishing. Modes of fishing	28

STATE of the REGISTRY of FISHING VESSELS on the COAST

No.	NAME OF DIVISION.	BOUNDARIES.	Registering Officer.	1st Class employed in 1875.			2nd Class employed in 1875.			3rd Class employed in 1875.			Total employed in 1875.		
				Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
29	Malahide, .	Mouth of Boyne, county Louth, to Whip of the Waters, Clontarf, county Dublin.	Stratford Tuke, Commander, R.N.	52	222	40	26	94	–	19	49	3	97	365	43
				334	1,689	259	2,534	9,720	253	3,051	10,782	405	5,919	22,191	917

No. 1—*continued.*

of IRELAND from 1st January, 1875, to 1st January, 1876.

Total employed in 1874.			Total Increase since 1874.			Total Decrease since 1874.			Substance of Observations made by Inspecting Commanders of Coast Guards and other Registering Officers, up to the 1st January, 1876.	No.
Vessels	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.		
									practised—long lines, trawlers, herring nets, and dredges for oysters. Good trawling ground from Lambay Island to St. John's Point, also from Ben Head to Dunany Point, and Maiden Tower to Ballywater. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good from coast, within the following stations, viz.:—Mouth of the Boyne, Clogher Head, Omeath and Greenore; at latter place much improvement within past year, and fish forwarded at moderate rates. At other places means of transit bad. A telegraph station would be a material advantage at Carlingford, where railway will be completed in a few months, and transit improved. No large shoals of fish appeared, except of herrings and mackerel off coast, within Greenore and Cranfield stations, in latter part of June and beginning of September. Means of capture good. Public oyster beds exist in Carlingford Lough and Rostrevor Bay. Supply decreasing. Spatting better in Carlingford Lough, but on the decline in Rostrevor Bay. No new natural banks lately discovered; does not consider there are any unworked. No steps taken to stock ground licensed for the establishment of private beds. Quality of oysters good; price at Carlingford, 16*s.* per hundred, at Rostrevor, 50*s.* to 60*s.* per thousand. Cannot ascertain amount realized by sale of oysters at Carlingford, but so far as could be learned, about £100 at Rostrevor. Scollops very scarce. Lobster and crab fisheries not improving. A great deal small-sized fish of both species sent to market; would not limit size that should be taken. States a much larger and more commodious harbour at Carlingford would greatly benefit fisheries of locality. That present enlargement is not capable of accommodating a larger class of boats. That fishing ground is very good, but fishermen require better craft for capturing. That a quay is also very much required at Greenore, as landing facilities are very insufficient. That from 200 to 700 first-class craft fished out of Carlingford Lough, between latter part of June and beginning of October. That a few could be permitted, when weather answered, to land their fish on board Holyhead boat. Others had to sell their fish to steamers buying fish inside and outside the Lough; the remainder to carry their fish to other points up the Lough, by which, from tides and other causes, they invariably lost that night's fishing, which frequently must have been considerable. States that more than 80 per cent. of vessels were Irish, and that a number of Manx boats were manned from county Down coast. Considers if a harbour was erected here (Greenore) it would be of unspeakable advantage and encouragement to the herring fishery of this coast.	
105	494	26	–	–	17	8	129	–	No portion of division unguarded. Fisheries not improving. Herring, cod, ling, skate, and conger eel most largely captured. No increase in quantity of fish appearing. On some parts of division herrings keeping further out to sea than formerly; other kinds of fish not. Craft and gear suitable. Five curing establishments at Rush, successful; much fish cured by individuals when prices low. No conflicts between persons pursuing different modes of capture. Fishermen very orderly. No emigration. Fishing generally combined with farming. Modes of fishing practised—nets, long lines, and trawling. Slight increase in latter. Trawling ground extending from Skerries Island to Carlingford Lough, much availed of. Means of transit of fish to market for sale good, but no improvement during past year. No large shoals of fish observed. A small oyster bank said to exist between St. Patrick's Island and Clogher Head, but small quantities captured. Supply not improving. Cannot say whether spatting better or worse than previous year. No new natural banks discovered. A private oyster bed stocked by Lord Talbot de Malahide. Quality of oysters pretty good; price, 8*s.* or 9*s.* per hundred. Cannot state amount realized by sale. No scollops found. Lobster and crab fisheries not improving. Small sized not sent to market. Restrictions as to limit of size or time of capture not requisite or desirable.	29
7,246	25,805	1119	107	244	156	1,434	3,858	358		
Gross Increase, .			–	–	–	–	–	–		
Gross Decrease, .			–	–	–	1,327	3,614	202		
Net Decrease, ...						1,327	3,614	202		

APPENDIX No. 2.

RETURN showing the Number of Boats registered by the Collectors of Customs during the year 1875.

Registered by Collector of Customs at	FIRST CLASS.			SECOND CLASS.			THIRD CLASS.			TOTAL.		
	Boats.	Men.	Boys.	Boats.	Men.	Boys.	Boats.	Men.	Boys.	Boats.	Men.	Boys.
Wexford, .	18	107	–	210	981	11	43	185	–	271	1,273	11
Youghal, .	2	12	–	23	116	5	18	126	4	43	254	9
Cork, . .	52	402	30	301	960	63	342	986	69	695	2,348	162
Westport, .	–	–	–	21	59	3	651	2,327	22	672	2,386	25
Belfast, . .	40	267	16	223	749	29	28	76	–	291	1,092	45
Galway, . .	5	17	5	371	1,261	24	410	1,408	17	786	2,686	46
Skibbereen, .	8	52	4	98	409	37	185	884	30	291	1,345	71
Waterford, .	21	90	11	184	719	8	39	143	3	244	952	22
Drogheda, .	2	11	1	57	259	5	54	108	10	113	378	16
Dublin, . .	161	933	116	351	1,850	28	114	466	36	626	3,249	180
Sligo, . .	1	5	–	113	576	79	361	1,895	114	475	2,476	193
Limerick, .	–	–	–	1	2	1	63	183	–	64	185	1
Tralee, . .	11	38	6	143	678	1	271	1,245	10	425	1,961	17
Coleraine, .	–	–	–	118	419	6	32	99	4	150	518	10
Londonderry, .	8	30	1	364	1,651	47	140	331	7	512	2,012	55
Dundalk, .	–	–	–	44	185	1	10	44	–	54	229	1
New Ross, .	1	5	–	78	261	11	21	65	2	100	331	13
Newry, . .	43	258	40	173	692	46	87	261	18	303	1,211	104
Ballina, . .	–	–	–	2	7	–	169	964	9	171	971	9
Total, .	373	2,227	230	2,875	11,834	405	3,038	11,796	355	6,286	25,857	990

APPENDIX No. 3.—ABSTRACT of RETURNS from COAST GUARD.

No.	NAME OF DISTRICT.	Registering Officer.	Solely engaged in Fishing.									Nearly altogether employed in Fishing.									Only partially employed in Fishing.									TOTALS.		
			First Class.			Second Class.			Third Class.			First Class.			Second Class.			Third Class.			First Class.			Second Class.			Third Class.					
			Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.	Vessels.	Men.	Boys.
1	Dublin,	Commander J. F. Lennon, R.N.,	99	401	90	24	40	2	24	60	3	–	–	–	24	125	–	10	–	–	–	–	–	14	36	7	12	94	18	207	756	120
2	Arklow,	Commander C. C. Rising, R.N.,	4	28	3	288	1,698	21	42	186	4	–	–	–	6	28	–	6	20	–	1	–	–	5	8	–	9	24	1	361	1,992	29
3	Wexford,	Commander H. E. Stephens, R.N.,	–	–	–	17	45	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	6	–	3	21	–	–	–	–	89	420	–	40	153	5	151	645	5
4	Waterford,	Commander H. W. Rochfort, R.N.,	8	24	8	6	18	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	4	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	101	304	–	36	53	–	152	403	10
5	Youghal,	Commander P. R. H. Parker, R.N.,	5	27	2	28	127	17	6	32	1	–	–	–	13	42	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	30	90	1	33	207	–	115	525	21
6	Queenstown,	Commander H. Talbot Price, R.N.,	4	16	–	47	172	3	15	48	12	1	5	–	5	22	–	2	10	2	1	6	1	46	168	10	9	29	4	130	476	32
7	Kinsale,	J. B. Warren, District Officer,	44	305	38	30	122	1	36	144	–	–	–	–	11	44	–	8	32	–	–	–	–	85	320	11	156	714	83	370	1,681	133
8	Skibbereen,	Commander J. S. Keats, R.N.,	4	19	2	12	72	4	30	120	10	2	12	2	11	60	6	129	230	15	1	8	–	54	175	17	94	349	7	337	1,045	63
9	Castletown Berehaven,	Lieut. W. I. B. Ogilvy, R.N.,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	4	–	14	56	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	32	–	178	612	–	201	704	–
10	Killarney,	P. Mahony, District Officer,	9	36	9	30	120	–	35	173	–	2	4	–	3	22	–	3	19	–	–	–	–	84	507	–	122	585	4	288	1,466	13
11	Ballyheigue,	W. Daish, District Officer,	–	–	–	6	12	–	12	31	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	31	93	–	60	180	–	110	319	–
12	Seafield,	Lieut. R. C. Joilliffe, R.N.,	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	48	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	14	42	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	117	351	4	147	441	11
13	Galway,	Commander James Grant, R.N.,	7	28	7	8	20	5	47	140	–	–	–	–	84	259	6	49	67	2	–	–	–	76	251	8	201	516	8	472	1,281	36
14	Clifden,	Commander J. R. Palmer, R.N.,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	176	518	4	349	1,382	40	525	1,900	44
15	Keel,	Robt. Geo. Gibbon, Dist. Officer,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	40	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	70	194	17	78	234	17
16	Belmullet,	Lieut. T. H. Beddoes, R.N.,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	21	65	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	151	413	–	172	478	–
17	Ballycastle, K.,	Lieut. H. S. Mandeville, R.N.,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	137	747	6	138	750	6
18	Pullendiva,	R. Bones, District Officer,	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	20	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	42	167	–	47	187	–
19	Sligo,	Lieut. F. C. R. Baker, R.N.,	–	–	–	2	6	–	10	50	–	–	–	–	3	16	–	5	12	8	1	5	–	32	133	14	125	570	21	178	792	43
20	Killybegs,	Lieut. F. Osburn, R.N.,	–	–	–	14	70	10	28	154	20	–	–	–	15	50	8	31	157	21	–	–	–	14	44	3	117	377	48	219	852	110
21	Dunfanaghy,	Nav. Lieut. E. C. Ball, R.N.,	–	–	–	16	67	1	50	100	6	–	–	–	3	12	3	20	40	–	–	–	–	62	232	35	63	114	4	214	565	49
22	Carn,	Commander S. M. Malet, R.N.,	6	19	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	36	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	271	1,036	6	61	375	1	344	1,466	11
23	Ballycastle, Antrim,	Commander Wm. Parsons, R.N.,	1	5	–	18	46	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	30	60	–	–	–	–	1	5	–	65	146	6	33	74	4	148	336	10
24	Carrickfergus,	Commander A. J. V. Collins, R.N.,	1	4	1	29	63	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	11	–	5	19	–	–	–	–	2	6	–	–	–	–	40	103	3
25	Donaghadee,	R. S. Hunt, District Officer,	1	4	–	7	31	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	10	24	–	–	–	–	19	125	16	50	110	7	4	9	1	92	305	24
26	Strangford,	R. Barnes, Divisional Officer,	2	15	2	13	28	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	12	20	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	101	206	–	–	–	–	128	269	8
27	Newcastle,	Commander Cameron, R.N.,	2	14	1	21	99	9	6	11	1	–	–	–	7	–	–	1	–	–	26	158	9	50	221	8	15	41	1	128	544	29
28	Carlingford,	Lieut. W. G. Gregory, R.N.,	25	166	25	46	228	5	1	4	1	–	–	–	17	87	1	1	3	–	3	21	3	119	499	–	118	303	12	330	1,311	47
29	Malahide,	Commander Stratford Tuke, R.N.,	52	222	40	26	86	–	15	40	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	–	4	9	3	97	365	43
			274	1,333	228	688	3,170	85	379	1,363	62	6	25	2	280	984	31	316	777	51	54	331	29	1,566	5,566	137	2,356	8,642	292	5,919	22,191	917

APPENDIX, No. 4.

HOWTH.—ABSTRACT of Returns of Herring Fishing for the year 1875, furnished and authenticated by Chief Officer of Coast Guard at Howth.

DATE. Week ending.	Average daily Number of Boats employed.				Number of Mease of 635 fish each.	Average price per Mease.	Gross Receipts.	Number of days Employed.	OBSERVATIONS.
	Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.					
1875.						£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
June 5,	–	16	–	2	170	1 1 7½	183 17 6	4	Small and mixed fish.
,, 12,	1	65	1	37	2,650	1 15 11	4,758 15 0	5	Good and do.
,, 19,	12	76	3	60	12,935	1 7 4½	17,699 17 6	6	Good fish.
,, 26,	90	103	7	88	10,055	1 4 8½	12,431 2 6	6	Good and mixed fish.
July 3,	103	96	9	88	9,800	1 10 11½	15,175 0 0	5	Do.
,, 10,	95	85	9	95	6,250	1 9 8½	9,285 0 0	6	Good fish.
,, 17,	139	58	11	78	4,710	1 14 11	8,223 15 0	4	Do. and mixed.
,, 24,	139	48	6	73	3,980	1 14 4¾	6,843 15 0	5	Do.
,, 31,	79	26	1	53	1,880	1 8 3¾	2,661 10 0	6	Do.
August 7,	4	6	1	12	1,940	0 18 7½	1,809 10 0	6	Do.
,, 14,	2	2	1	12	3,220	0 16 4½	2,636 10 0	6	Do.
,, 21,	1	1	–	8	1,160	0 14 5¼	837 17 0	4	Do.
,, 28,	–	–	–	7	18	1 10 2¾	27 4 0	2	Mixed fish.
September 4,	1	–	–	1	9	1 18 0	17 2 0	1	Do.
,, 11,	–	–	–	5	250	1 0 6½	256 15 0	5	Do.
,, 18,	–	–	–	4	361	1 0 11½	378 6 0	5	Do. and good.
,, 25,	–	–	1	9	261	1 5 5½	332 4 0	2	Do.
October 2,	–	–	2	6	45	1 9 6	66 7 6	1	Do.
,, 9,	–	–	–	–	–	—	—	–	—
,, 16,	–	–	4	2	164	1 8 11½	237 10 0	3	Mixed and small fish.
,, 23,	–	–	29	20	970	1 2 9¾	1,107 10 0	3	Do. and good.
,, 30,	–	–	1	13	141	1 10 11	218 0 6	3	Do.
November 6,	–	2	82	31	1,452	1 0 7¾	1,499 7 0	3	Good fish.
,, 13,	–	2	61	25	4,720	0 15 1¾	3,574 0 0	6	Do. and mixed.
,, 20,	–	1	45	23	230	1 1 0	241 10 0	2	Mixed fish.
Totals,	–	–	–	–	67,371	1 6 10½	90,502 5 6	99	
Daily averages for the 99 days worked,	35	32	11	38	681	—	—	–	

APPENDIX, No. 5.

WEEKLY RETURN of the Herring Fishery at ARDGLASS for the year 1875.

DATE.	Number of Vessels employed.					No. of Mease.	Average Price.	Gross Receipts.	No. of Nights out.	Greatest Number of Boats in during the Week.
	Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.	Total.					
1875.							£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
June 1 to 5,	–	64	–	20	84	100	1 2 6	112 10 0	4	June 2, 100
,, 5 ,, 12,	–	94	–	20	114	124	1 2 6	139 10 0	3	,, 7, 124
,, 12 ,, 19,	–	148	1	25	174	3,734	0 17 0	3,173 18 0	3	,, 15, 174
,, 19 ,, 26,	–	165	11	34	210	4,457	0 18 6	4,122 14 6	4	,, 23, 210
,, 26 ,, July 3,	–	175	20	35	230	4,755	0 17 6	4,160 12 6	3	,, 29, 230
July 3 ,, 10,	1	169	22	36	228	5,497	1 2 6	6,184 2 6	5	July 7, 230
,, 10 ,, 17,	1	158	20	36	215	1,896	1 5 0	2,370 0 0	2	,, 13, 228
,, 17 ,, 24,	5	151	12	36	204	5,542	1 5 0	6,927 10 0	4	,, 19, 215
,, 24 ,, 31,	5	153	15	36	209	9,979	1 2 6	11,226 7 6	5	,, 27, 209
,, 31 ,, Aug. 7,	20	154	45	40	259	9,236	0 14 0	6,465 4 0	5	Aug. 2, 259
Aug. 7 to 14,	17	150	46	40	253	9,955	0 12 0	5,973 0 0	5	,, 11, 259
,, 14 ,, 21,	11	135	52	40	238	8,789	0 12 6	5,493 2 6	4	,, 16, 253
,, 21 ,, 28,	8	70	15	30	123	6,295	0 13 6	4,249 2 6	4	,, 25, 238
,, 28 ,, Sept. 4,	7	17	6	30	60	1,500	0 14 6	1,087 10 0	3	Sept. 1, 123
Sept. 4 to 11,	5	17	8	30	60	2,896	0 16 0	2,316 16 0	5	,, 6, 60
,, 11 ,, 18,	3	20	5	30	58	2,117	0 15 0	1,587 15 0	5	,, 14, 60
,, 18 ,, 25,	–	7	–	30	37	29	1 2 6	32 12 6	1	,, 22, 58
,, 25 ,, Oct. 2,	–	4	2	28	34	36	1 0 0	36 0 0	2	,, 27, 37
Oct. 2 to Oct. 9,	–	2	4	18	24	20	1 1 0	21 0 0	2	Oct. 4, 34
										,, 6, 24
Totals,	–	–	–	–	–	76,957	—	65,671 7 6	–	

REMARKS.—The herring fishery this year was good, being equal to last year, which was the best season for the last ten years, but the prices were not so good as last year. The fishing vessels consisted of English, Irish, Scotch, and Manx, the greater number being Scotch. There was a sufficient number of buyers at all times; and three curing establishments have been tried by Scotch buyers, and 4,050 barrels of herrings have been cured, each barrel containing 800 herrings, which were shipped to Glasgow by steamers and sailing vessels. There have been taken on an average 20,000 mease of herrings by steamers from the fishing boats outside, when becalmed and could not get into harbour, which fish were taken to Liverpool and Holyhead, which is not shown in this Return. The fishermen would remain longer here to fish, but they are afraid to remain too late in the season, owing to the bad state of the harbour, as there is no security for their boats and other property. The fishing would last longer here if there was an improvement made to the harbour.

APPENDIX, No. 6.

ABSTRACT of Returns of Herring Fishing off Kilkeel during the year 1875, furnished and authenticated by the Officer of Coast Guard.

KILKEEL.—Herrings, 1,600 mease of 500 each, at 17*s* 6*d*., . . £1,360.

APPENDIX, No. 6.

APPENDIX, No. 6.—*continued.*

ARKLOW.—ABSTRACT of Returns of Herring Fishing for the year 1875, furnished and authenticated by the Chief Officer of Coast Guard at Arklow.

Date, Week Ending.	Average Daily No. of Boats Employed.	Number of Mease of 635 Fish.	Average Price per Mease of 635 Fish.	Gross Receipts.	No. of Days Employed.	Observations.
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
June 12,	80	313	1 16 0	563 8 0	4	Weather unfavourable.
,, 19,	196	1,330	1 10 11	2,057 0 0	5	Fresh gale.
,, 26,	170	1,700	1 1 8¼	1,943 15 0	6	Weather squally.
July 3,	172	1,650	1 8 2¾	2,328 15 0	5	Do. Fresh gale.
,, 10,	190	2,150	1 11 7¾	3,402 10 0	6	
,, 17,	157	1,400	1 14 1¾	2,390 0 0	4	One day's fish sold at Wicklow. Fresh and strong gales.
,, 24,	5	30	1 10 0	45 0 0	1	Boats getting out to go north.
,, 31,	–	–	–	–	–	No fishing. Boats proceeded to Howth.
Aug. 7,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 14,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 21,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 28,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
Sept. 4,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 11,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 18,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 25,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
Oct. 2,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 9,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 16,	–	–	–	–	–	Do.
,, 23,	18	19	1 16 0½	34 5 0	3	
,, 30,	–	–	–	–	–	No fishing.
Nov. 6,	95	678	1 0 0	678 0 0	4	Fresh gale.
,, 13,	109	1,130	1 0 0	1,130 0 0	5	Do.
,, 20,	120	2,320	0 19 2½	2,230 0 0	5	Do.
,, 27,	79	935	1 5 8½	1,202 10 0	6	
Dec. 4,	117	960	1 3 9½	1,142 10 0	4	Strong breeze.
,, 11,	60	219	1 8 8	314 0 0	6	Threatened snow storm.
,, 18,	22	34	1 11 6½	53 12 6	5	Fish poor and scarce. Boats preparing for dredging.
,, 26,	2	7	1 15 6	12 8 6	1	
	–	14,875	1 6 3	19,527 14 0	70	
Daily average for the 70 days worked,	113	212½	1 6 3	278 18 1½	–	

ARKLOW.—ABSTRACT of Returns of Oyster Fishing for the year 1875, furnished and authenticated by the Chief Officer of Coast Guard at Arklow.

Date.	Number of Barrels.	Average Price per Barrel.	Gross Receipts.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
22nd January to 5th February,	39	1 0 2	39 6 6
9th February ,, 11th ,,	86	1 1 0	90 6 0
15th ,, ,, 20th ,,	584	1 1 0	613 4 0
8th March ,, 15th March,	360	1 1 0	378 0 0
15th ,, ,, 22nd ,,	594	1 1 0	623 14 0
22nd ,, ,, 29th ,,	830	1 1 0	871 10 0
29th ,, ,, 5th April,	738	1 1 0	774 18 0
5th April ,, 12th ,,	224	1 1 0	235 4 0
12th ,, ,, 19th ,,	878	1 1 0	921 18 0
19th ,, ,, 26th ,,	1,001	1 1 4	1,068 7 0
26th ,, ,, 3rd May,	884	1 0 10¼	921 14 0
1st September ,, 4th September,	519	0 18 0	467 2 0
4th ,, ,, 11th ,,	1,070	0 17 1½	916 10 0
11th ,, ,, 18th ,,	565	0 14 6	409 12 6
18th ,, ,, 23rd ,,	326	0 16 2¾	264 14 0
23rd ,, ,, 2nd October,	320	0 18 0	288 0 0
2nd October ,, 9th ,,	499	0 18 0	449 2 0
9th ,, ,, 16th ,,	105	0 17 9	93 5 0
Total,	9,622	0 19 7	9,426 7 0

APPENDIX, No. 6—*continued.*

Return of Herring Fishing at Omeath and Warrenpoint, for the year 1875.

DATE.	Number of Boats employed. Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.	Number of Mease.	Average price per Mease. £ s. d.	Gross Receipts. £ s. d.	DATE.	Number of Boat employed. Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.	Number of Mease.	Average price per Mease. £ s. d.	Gross Receipts. £ s. d.
June 12,	–	–	–	3	30	1 2 0	33 0 0	July 30,	–	–	–	4	40	1 16 0	72 0 0
„ 15,	–	–	–	2	12	1 4 0	14 8 0	„ 31,	–	–	–	5	25	0 19 0	23 15 0
„ 16,	–	–	–	3	50	1 10 0	75 0 0	Aug. 3,	–	–	–	5	90	1 2 6	101 5 0
„ 17,	–	–	–	2	15	1 5 0	18 15 0	„ 4,	–	–	–	5	70	1 1 6	75 5 0
„ 18,	–	–	–	8	150	0 17 0	127 10 0	„ 5,	–	–	–	2	17	1 2 6	19 2 6
„ 19,	–	–	–	11	11	0 13 0	7 3 0	„ 6,	3	–	–	5	30	0 17 6	26 5 0
„ 22,	–	–	–	11	160	0 13 0	104 0 0	„ 7,	–	–	–	9	175	0 12 6	109 7 6
„ 23,	–	–	2	9	560	0 11 0	308 0 0	„ 9,	–	–	–	5	30	1 17 6	56 5 0
„ 24,	–	–	1	7	280	0 12 6	175 0 0	„ 10,	–	–	–	4	60	1 16 0	108 0 0
„ 25,	–	–	3	4	102	0 11 0	56 2 0	„ 11,	–	–	–	6	120	1 16 0	216 0 0
„ 26,	–	–	4	1	24	0 12 0	14 8 0	„ 12,	–	–	2	7	270	0 12 6	168 15 0
„ 29,	–	–	–	1	10	0 19 0	9 10 0	„ 13,	–	–	–	5	250	0 11 6	143 15 0
„ 30,	–	–	–	1	50	0 19 0	47 10 0	„ 14,	5	–	–	15	150	0 8 6	63 15 0
July 1,	–	–	2	2	27	0 17 6	23 12 6	„ 17,	–	–	–	4	50	0 12 6	31 5 0
„ 3,	–	–	5	2	20	0 18 0	18 0 0	„ 19,	–	–	–	5	30	0 12 6	18 15 0
„ 7,	–	–	–	1	15	1 0 0	15 0 0	„ 21,	5	3	–	35	295	0 8 6	125 17 6
„ 8,	–	–	–	1	40	1 0 0	40 0 0	„ 23,	–	–	–	3	55	0 14 6	39 7 6
„ 10,	–	–	–	1	33	1 3 0	37 19 0	„ 24,	–	–	–	5	45	0 14 6	32 12 6
„ 11,	–	–	–	1	60	1 0 0	60 0 0	Sept. 1,	–	–	–	3	47	1 1 6	50 10 6
„ 13,	–	–	–	1	35	1 5 0	43 15 0	„ 4,	–	–	–	5	15	1 1 6	16 2 6
„ 17,	–	–	1	1	24	1 12 0	38 8 0	„ 8,	–	–	–	2	12	0 18 0	10 16 0
„ 19,	–	–	–	1	20	1 2 0	22 0 0	„ 9,	–	–	–	3	15	0 17 6	13 2 6
„ 21,	–	1	–	4	160	0 17 6	139 15 0	„ 11,	–	–	–	4	19	0 15 0	14 5 0
„ 23,	–	–	–	2	130	1 1 6	146 4 0	„ 14,	–	–	–	3	16	0 16 6	13 4 0
„ 24,	–	–	2	–	15	1 2 6	16 17 6	„ 15,	–	–	–	7	67	0 15 0	50 5 0
„ 27,	–	–	–	2	11	1 3 6	12 18 6	„ 18,	–	–	–	3	11	0 16 0	8 16 0
„ 28,	–	–	–	5	55	0 19 0	52 5 0	„ 22,	–	–	–	10	95	0 16 0	76 0 0
„ 29,	–	–	–	2	10	1 16 0	18 0 0	Total,	–	–	–	–	4,208	–	3,353 5 6

Return of Herring Fishing at Greenore.

DATE.	Number of Boats employed. Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.	Number of Mease.	Average price per Mease. £ s. d.	Gross Receipts. £ s. d.	DATE.	Number of Boats employed. Cornish.	Scotch.	Manx.	Irish.	Number of Mease.	Average price per Mease. £ s. d.	Gross Receipts. £ s. d.
June 10,	–	–	–	2	35	1 7 0	47 5 0	August 17,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
„ 11,	–	–	–	2	57	1 5 0	71 5 0	„ 18,	–	–	–	1	16	1 10 0	24 0 0
„ 12,	–	–	–	3	125	1 2 6	140 12 6	„ 20,	–	2	–	4	210	1 1 0	220 10 0
„ 16,	–	–	–	3	168	1 3 0	193 4 0	„ 21,	–	–	–	2	65	1 3 0	74 15 0
„ 17,	–	–	–	9	401	0 15 0	300 15 0	„ 23,	–	1	1	7	220	0 17 6	192 10 0
„ 18,	–	–	–	3	140	1 0 0	140 0 0	„ 25,	–	–	–	2	56	1 12 6	91 0 0
„ 19,	–	–	–	6	158	0 13 6	106 13 6	„ 28,	–	–	–	1	30	1 1 6	32 5 0
„ 21,	–	–	–	4	152	0 15 6	117 16 0	„ 30,	–	–	–	2	36	1 2 0	39 12 0
„ 22,	–	–	–	12	687	0 11 0	377 17 0	September 1,	–	1	–	3	90	0 17 6	78 15 0
„ 23,	–	–	–	10	505	0 12 6	315 12 6	„ 4,	–	–	1	1	60	1 10 6	91 10 0
„ 24,	–	–	–	8	365	0 11 6	209 17 6	„ 6,	–	1	1	2	75	1 7 6	103 2 6
„ 25,	–	–	–	3	150	0 12 0	90 0 0	„ 7,	–	–	–	6	256	1 7 6	352 0 0
„ 26,	–	–	–	1	20	1 0 0	20 0 0	„ 8,	–	–	–	1	55	1 0 0	55 0 0
„ 29,	–	–	–	3	60	1 3 6	70 10 0	„ 9,	–	1	–	3	104	0 19 0	98 16 0
„ 30,	–	–	2	8	284	1 3 6	333 14 0	„ 10,	–	–	1	6	145	1 1 0	152 5 0
July 1,	–	–	2	5	385	1 0 0	385 0 0	„ 11,	–	–	–	4	172	1 3 0	197 16 0
„ 2,	–	–	–	1	12	1 5 0	15 0 0	„ 13,	–	1	–	2	103	0 17 6	90 2 6
„ 6,	–	2	–	9	650	1 3 0	747 10 0	„ 14,	–	–	–	3	132	1 5 0	165 0 0
„ 7,	–	–	–	10	308	1 3 0	354 4 0	„ 15,	–	–	–	1	40	1 10 0	60 0 0
„ 8,	–	–	1	8	456	1 6 0	592 16 0	„ 16,	–	1	–	2	117	1 1 0	122 17 0
„ 9,	–	–	2	6	236	0 15 6	182 18 0	„ 17,	–	–	–	1	50	1 7 6	68 15 0
„ 10,	–	–	1	3	40	1 5 0	50 0 0	„ 18,	–	–	1	4	104	1 4 0	124 16 0
„ 13,	–	2	–	6	110	1 7 6	151 5 0	„ 20,	–	–	–	3	109	0 17 6	95 7 6
„ 14,	–	–	–	7	250	1 10 0	375 0 0	„ 21,	–	1	–	6	400	1 5 0	500 0 0
„ 15,	–	–	–	2	32	1 10 0	48 0 0	„ 22,	–	–	–	4	190	1 2 6	213 15 0
„ 16,	–	–	–	1	28	1 8 0	39 4 0	„ 23,	–	–	–	1	17	1 10 0	25 10 0
„ 17,	–	–	–	3	56	1 12 6	91 0 0	„ 29,	–	–	–	4	90	1 3 6	105 15 0
„ 19,	–	–	–	1	20	1 12 0	32 0 0	October 1,	–	–	–	4	25	1 12 6	40 12 6
„ 20,	–	–	–	3	69	1 10 0	103 10 0	„ 2,	–	–	–	1	12	1 12 6	19 10 0
„ 21,	–	–	–	3	165	1 7 6	226 17 6	„ 3,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
„ 22,	–	–	–	7	250	1 5 6	318 15 0	„ 5,	–	1	–	3	25	1 12 6	40 12 6
„ 23,	–	1	–	3	70	1 3 6	82 5 0	„ 7,	–	–	–	3	17	1 12 6	27 16 6
„ 24,	–	1	–	4	160	1 8 6	228 0 0	„ 8,	–	–	–	6	78	1 12 6	126 15 0
„ 26,	–	–	–	5	253	1 5 6	322 11 6	„ 9,	–	–	1	4	65	1 10 0	97 10 0
„ 27,	–	–	1	10	704	1 4 0	844 16 0	„ 10,	–	–	–	3	15	1 10 0	22 10 0
„ 28,	–	1	–	3	63	1 5 0	78 15 0	„ 11,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
„ 29,	–	–	–	1	2	1 1 0	2 2 0	„ 12,	–	–	–	8	280	1 10 0	420 0 0
„ 31,	–	–	1	8	300	1 0 0	300 0 0	„ 13,	–	–	1	7	200	1 10 0	300 0 0
August 2,	–	–	–	1	27	1 5 0	33 15 0	„ 14,	–	–	–	5	46	1 12 0	73 12 0
„ 3,	–	2	–	4	360	0 15 6	279 0 0	November 8,	–	–	–	4	9	1 7 6	12 7 6
„ 4,	–	–	–	3	103	1 0 0	103 0 0	„ 9,	–	–	–	4	20	1 10 0	30 0 0
„ 5,	–	1	–	3	120	0 18 0	108 0 0	„ 10,	–	–	–	3	7	1 5 0	8 15 0
„ 6,	–	1	1	9	750	0 11 6	431 5 0	„ 13,	–	–	–	2	4	1 0 0	4 0 0
„ 7,	–	–	–	5	185	0 14 6	134 2 6	„ 16,	–	–	–	3	5	0 16 0	4 0 0
„ 9,	–	–	–	4	158	1 0 0	158 0 0	„ 17,	–	–	–	4	11	0 17 6	9 12 6
„ 10,	–	1	1	6	390	0 17 6	341 5 0	„ 18,	–	–	–	5	15	0 15 0	11 5 0
„ 11,	–	–	–	4	270	1 0 0	270 0 0	„ 19,	–	–	–	2	5	1 0 0	5 0 0
„ 12,	–	1	–	10	780	0 11 6	448 10 0	„ 22,	–	–	–	4	19	0 17 0	8 10 0
„ 13,	–	–	1	6	280	1 2 6	315 0 0	„ 23,	–	–	–	3	5	0 15 0	3 15 0
„ 14,	–	–	1	2	52	1 8 0	72 16 0	„ 27,	–	–	–	2	4	0 14 0	2 16 0
„ 15,	–	–	–	–	–	–	–								
„ 16,	–	1	1	3	110	0 17 6	123 15 0	Total,	–	–	–	–	15,311	—	15,471 0 0

APPENDIX, Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9.

APPENDIX No. 6.—*continued.*

ABSTRACT of the DELIVERIES of SALMON and GRILSE consigned for Sale to Billingsgate Market, London, from the 1st of January to the 31st of December, 1875, per Box of 150 lbs. each.

	No. of Boxes.		No. of Boxes.
Scotch,	19,942	Norway,	572
Irish,	5,745		
English and Welsh,	1,322	Total for 1875,	31,958
Berwick,	963	,, 1874,	41,581
Dutch,	3,003		
Sweden,	411	Decrease,	9,623

APPENDIX No. 7.—SUMMARY of the quantity of FISH exported to England, consigned from the Irish Fisheries, from the 1st of January to the 31st of December, 1875.

	Salmon.	Herrings.	Mackerel.	Cod.
	No. of Boxes of 150 lbs. each.	No. of Boxes of 2 cwt. each.	No. of Boxes of 2 cwt. each.	No. of Boxes of 2 cwt. each.
London,	5,745	30,406	27,983	12,050
Nottingham,	2,911	3,777	2,666	4,796
Bradford,	2,805	6,800	3,760	2,999
Manchester,	7,552	16,768	9,699	9,731
Sheffield,	3,409	7,676	5,978	2,466
Wolverhampton,	2,311	5,377	3,681	1,987
Leeds,	3,676	6,821	4,935	2,801
Liverpool,	8,888½	19,024	12,776	11,777
Birmingham,	6,977	11,976	5,003	5,985
Total, 1875,	44,274½	108,625	76,681	54,592
,, 1874,	43,638½	103,209	69,050	50,440
Increase,	636	5,416	7,631	4,152

APPENDIX No. 8.—RETURN of the quantity of Fish captured and brought into Courtown Harbour during the year 1875.

	£	s.	d.			£	s.	d.	
Herrings, 1,000 mease, at	0	18	0	per mease.	Cod, 350, at	0	1	6	per head.
Oysters, 590 barrels, at	1	0	0	,, barrel.	Soles, 300 pair, at	0	1	6	,, pair.

APPENDIX No. 9.—RETURN of FISH carried over the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, during the year 1875.

Description of Fish.	No.	Tons.	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Salmon and Trout, in baskets,	604	3	11	0	12
White or Coarse Fish, including Herrings, in boxes,	4,035	381	17	1	6
,, in baskets,	401	31	7	0	27
,, in bundles,	180	7	11	1	0
,, in barrels,	982	102	9	3	22
,, in hampers,	64	6	8	0	0
Total,	–	533	4	3	21

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From all Stations during the year 1875, White or Coarse Fish, 2,101 tons; Salmon and Trout, 283 tons.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to all Stations by the Waterford and Central of Ireland Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons.	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Waterford,	–	1,012	89	10	1	25	20	–	1	3	1	25
Ballyhale,	–	–		—			–	31	0	13	1	2
Thomastown,	–	–		—			132	160	8	10	2	15
Bennettsbridge,	–	1	0	0	3	0	–	5	0	1	0	26
Kilkenny,	–	–		—			–	24	0	15	3	5
Total,	–	1,013	89	11	0	25	152	220	11	4	1	17

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Waterford and Limerick Railway, during the Year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Foynes,	–	–		—			1,682	–	174	12	0	21
Limerick,	–	–		—			454	1,302	87	3	1	6
Tipperary,	–	–		—			–	–		—		
Bansha,	1	–	0	0	2	0	–	–		—		
Caher,	–	–		—			26	–	0	5	0	6
Clonmel,	–	–		—			93	–	4	9	1	0
Carrick,	–	–		—			–	299	8	16	3	0
Fidetown,	–	–		—			–	–		—		
Waterford to Stations up the Line,	53	352	14	0	1	9	42	1,097	103	16	1	3
Total,	54	352	14	0	3	9	2,297	2,698	379	2	3	8

Weight of boxes and baskets included.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Waterford and Tramore Railway Company during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

TRAMORE TO WATERFORD.—The fish conveyed over this Company's line consist principally of Hake, Cod, Mackerel, and Gurnet, and comes at such irregular intervals and in such small quantities that it is not booked by weight. The estimated quantity carried during the past year (1875) would be about 5 to 6 tons.

RETURN of WHITE or COARSE FISH conveyed to Limerick for London, by the Limerick and Ennis Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Date and from what Station.	Boxes.	Tons	cwt.	qr.	lbs.
ENNIS.—From 2nd January to 16th December, 1875, .	53	3	11	1	3

Weight of boxes included.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Paddington by the Limerick, Castleconnell, and Killaloe Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Castleconnell, . . .	630 boxes (eels).	55	2	2	0

Weight of boxes included.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Cork and Kinsale Junction Railway Company from Kinsale Station, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Description of Fish.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Description of Fish.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Turbot, ...	0	10	0	0	Gurnet, ...		—		
Plaice, ...		—			Scad, ...		—		
Soles, ...	0	6	0	0	Pollock, ...		—		
Haddock, ...		—			Mullet, ...		—		
Cod, ...	36	3	0	0	Sprat, ...	0	5	0	0
Whiting, ...	0	4	0	0	Lobsters, ...	0	4	0	0
Hake, ...	100	0	0	0	Crabs, ...		—		
Mackerel, ...	1,543	6	0	0	Oysters, ...	1	9	0	0
Herrings, ...	8	3	0	0	Eels, ...		—		
Pilchards, ...	1	6	0	0	Winkles, ...	5	7	0	0
Ling, ...	2	0	0	0					
Bream, ...	0	1	0	0		1,699	4	0	0

The weight of packages and ice included.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Cork by the Trains and Steamers of the Cork, Blackrock, and Passage Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From 1st January to 31st December.—Queenstown to Cork.—1,045 baskets White or Coarse Fish (mostly), each basket containing a half cwt. of fish (net.)

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Strabane by the Finn Valley Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.		Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
STRANORLAR.—White or Coarse Fish, . . .		42	2	1	9	0	0
,, Salmon and Trout, ...		2	35	1	17	1	0
	Total, . . .	44	37	3	6	1	0

This weight includes the weight of the packages and ice.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Salmon and Trout.		Weight.
	Boxes.	Baskets.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons cwt. qrs. lbs.
Belfast, ...	1,544	99	–	–	
Carrickfergus, ...	–	1,461	–	–	
Antrim, ...	–	–	935	1	
Toome, ...	5,399	81	87	173	
Moneymore, ...	265	–	–	–	
Cookstown, ...	19	–	–	–	
Ballymoney, ...	325	75	78	46	—
Coleraine, ...	62	8	639	–	
Portrush, ...	708	29	766	–	
Magilligan, ...	137	46	151	106	
Limavady, ...	–	–	75	–	
Londonderry, ...	56	6	1,230	–	
Portstewart, ...	198	3	89	–	
Total, ...	8,713	1,808	4,050	326	—

APPENDIX, No. 9.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Londonderry by the Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Buncrana,	140	24	11	19	0	0	10	21	1	19	0	0
Rathmullan,	20	40	2	10	0	0	62	13	6	10	0	0
Ramelton,	6	–	0	12	0	0	155	–	12	5	0	0
Fahan,	110	50	8	2	2	0	–	–		—		
Total,	276	114	23	3	2	0	227	34	20	14	0	0

Above gives gross weight, and includes weight of ice and package.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Ulster Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Belfast,	5	1,316	13	18	2	14	–	–		—		
Moira,	212	133	23	15	0	12	–	–		—		
Lurgan,	–	–		—			319	–	20	15	3	0
Total,	217	1,449	37	13	2	26	319	–	20	15	3	0

The weight of boxes, &c., is included in above.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Portadown, Dungannon, and Omagh Junction Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Annaghmore,	644	–	44	7	2	6
Trew and Moy,	6	–	0	9	3	18
Total,	650	–	44	17	1	24

The weight of boxes, &c., is included in above.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Carrickfergus and Larne Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Station.	White or Coarse Fish.	
Larne,	62 boxes.	216 baskets.
Whitehead,	–	66 ,,

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Dublin and Antrim Junction Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons.	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Glenavy,	225	30	13	11	1	23
Crumlin,	141	–	7	6	2	5
Total,	366	30	20	18	0	0

The weight of boxes, &c., is included in above

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Midland Great Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight			
	Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Galway,	1,434	1,587	203	18	0	0	849	–	76	3	0	0
Oranmore,	15	–	1	0	0	0	–	–		—		
Athlone,	280	–	23	7	0	0	–	–		—		
Ballinasloe,	14	–	1	0	0	0	–	–		—		
Sligo,	56	261	31	12	0	0	230	–	14	8	0	0
Ballysodare,	4	–	4	0	0	0	289	–	24	7	0	0
Ballymote,	–	–		—			5	–	0	10	0	0
Boyle,	18	–	1	6	0	0	–	–		—		
Dromod,	35	–	2	7	0	0	–	–		—		
Total,	1,856	1,844	268	10	0	0	1,373	–	115	8	0	0

Above weight includes ice and packages.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.* APPENDIX, No. 9.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Great Northern and Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Roscommon,	15	–	1	3	0	0	–	–				
Westport,	128	29	20	7	0	0	457	–	35	16	0	0
Foxford,	–	–					251	–	21	8	0	0
Ballina,	40	6	1	11	0	0	516	40	50	3	0	0
Total,	183	35	23	1	0	0	1,224	40	107	7	0	0

Above weight includes ice and packages.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Dundalk, Newry, and Greenore Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
June. From Greenore,	162	–	16	4	0	0
July. " "	367	–	36	14	0	0
August. " "	809	–	80	18	0	0
September. " "	1,775	–	177	10	0	0
October, " "	142	–	14	4	0	0
Total,	3,255	–	325	10	0	0

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Irish North-Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Stations.		White or Coarse Fish.			Weight.				Salmon and Trout.			Weight.			
From	To	Boxes.	Baskets.	Packages.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Packages.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Culloville,	Ballybay	–	–	–			—		–	–	2	0	0	0	11
Strabane,	Dublin,	–	–	–			—		63	26	–	2	9	0	3
"	Belfast,	–	–	–			—		23	1	–	0	13	1	11
"	Monaghan,	–	–	–			—		1	1	–	0	0	0	27
"	Armagh	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	0	0	5
"	Trew and Moy,	–	–	–			—		–	1	–	0	0	0	2
"	Portadown,	–	–	–			—		3	–	–	0	0	0	22
"	Derry,	–	–	–			—		6	3	–	0	3	1	27
"	Newtownstewart,	–	–	–			—		2	2	–	0	0	3	18
"	Fintona,	–	–	–			—		–	1	–	0	0	0	6
"	Enniskillen,	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	0	1	0
"	Lisnaskea,	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	0	0	6
"	Clones,	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	0	0	6
"	Cavan,	–	–	–			—		3	–	–	0	0	0	21
"	Irvinestown,	–	–	–			—		3	1	–	0	0	1	25
St. Johnston,	Derry,	–	–	–			—		5	–	11	0	3	2	24
"	Stranorlar,	–	–	–			—		–	–	4	0	1	0	0
Derry,	"	–	–	1	0	2	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Belfast,	2	2	7	0	10	0	7	–	–	–		—		
"	Dungannon,	–	2	–	0	3	2	6	–	–	–		—		
"	Armagh,	11	1	–	0	17	3	7	10	1	1	1	4	0	0
"	Monaghan,	–	–	–			—		2	–	–	0	1	1	15
"	London,	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	0	1	20
"	Liverpool,	3	1	–	0	6	2	14	–	–	–		—		
"	Wolverhampton,	–	–	–			—		1	–	–	0	2	0	0
"	Dublin,	–	2	–	0	3	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Moate,	–	–	1	0	1	1	14	–	–	–		—		
Pettigo,	Enniskillen,	3	–	–	0	6	2	0	–	–	–		—		
Belleek,	Dublin,	30	–	–	2	15	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Crewe,	1	–	–	0	1	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Birmingham,	261	–	–	19	16	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	London,	479	–	–	34	3	0	0	–	–	–		—		
Ballyshannon,	"	61	–	–	3	14	3	0	514	–	–	51	5	2	0
"	Liverpool,	8	–	–	0	10	0	0	108	–	–	10	11	0	0
"	Birmingham,	–	–	–			—		73	–	–	7	7	0	0
"	Manchester,	–	–	–			—		181	–	–	19	17	0	0
Bundoran,	Enniskillen,	22	47	–	3	2	3	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Omagh,	3	7	–	0	16	0	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Clones,	–	21	–	1	18	1	11	–	–	–		—		
"	Cavan,	–	5	–	0	9	2	0	–	–	–		—		
"	Monaghan,	2	–	–	0	1	1	5	4	–	–	0	2	1	9
"	Dublin,	5	3	–	0	4	3	0	3	12	–	0	13	3	17
"	London,	39	–	9	2	17	0	2	–	–	–		—		
"	Manchester,	1	–	–	0	0	3	0	29	–	–	2	9	3	0
Total,		931	91	18	73	1	0	10	1,039	49	18	97	7	1	23

APPENDIX, No. 9.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Belfast, Hollywood, and Bangor Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Date and from what Station.	Description.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
1875. December 31st.—Bangor—	White or Coarse Fish, . .	124	511	38	3	1	14

The weight includes weight of the packages.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Banbridge, Lisburn, and Belfast Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	Description.	Box.	Ton	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Mullafernaghan—	White or Coarse Fish, . . .	1	0	1	1	21

The weight of boxes, &c., is included in above.

RETURN of FISH conveyed by the Kilkenny Junction Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	Description.	Baskets.	Weight.
Maryborough.—	Salmon and Trout, ...	2	19 lbs.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Holyhead by the Steamers of the London and North-Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Stations.		White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
		Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
1875.													
January, . .	Athlone, . . .	18	–	1	1	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	279	–	27	18	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Galway, . . .	14	–	1	8	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Kilkenny, . . .	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	3	0
,, . .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			12	–	1	2	0	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			15	3	1	2	0	0
February, .	Athlone, . . .	21	–	1	11	2	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			6	–	0	5	1	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	97	–	9	11	0	0	7	–	0	10	1	0
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	395	–	39	10	0	0	2	–	0	4	0	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	5	–	0	10	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Kilkenny, . . .	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	0	0
,, . .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			7	–	0	12	0	0
,, . .	Kinsale, . . .	4	–	0	8	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Fermoy, . . .	–	–		—			3	–	0	3	3	0
,, . .	Wexford, . . .	5	1	0	14	1	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			7	–	0	13	3	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			1	–	0	0	2	0
March, . .	Athlone, . . .	29	–	2	3	2	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			1	6	0	4	2	14
,, . .	Cork, . . .	128	–	12	16	0	0	73	1	6	8	2	14
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	316	–	31	12	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Fermoy, . . .	–	–		—			7	–	0	7	3	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	4	–	0	7	0	0	5	–	0	7	3	0
,, . .	Kilkenny, . .	–	–		—			9	–	0	7	0	14
,, . .	Kinsale, . . .	150	–	15	0	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Limerick, . . .	–	–		—			15	1	1	1	0	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			18	–	1	2	3	0
,, . .	Wexford, . . .	20	9	3	8	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			108	–	122	1	0	0
April, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			4	11	0	14	1	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	1,060	–	106	0	0	0	58	–	5	7	1	0
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	1,730	–	173	0	0	0	19	–	1	18	0	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	–	–		—			13	–	0	9	2	0
,, . .	Kilkenny, . . .	–	–		—			3	–	0	3	3	0
,, . .	Kinsale, . . .	68	–	6	16	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Limerick, . . .	–	–		—			10	1	0	12	1	0
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			126	–	13	1	2	0
May, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			7	–	0	9	3	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	2,276	–	227	12	0	0	69	–	5	0	1	0
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	2,323	–	232	6	0	0	15	2	1	13	0	0
,, . .	Foxford, . . .	–	–		—			47	–	4	0	3	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	–	–		—			28	–	2	2	0	0
,, . .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			8	–	0	16	0	0
,, . .	Limerick, . . .	–	–		—			7	1	0	10	2	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			20	–	1	3	3	0
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			224	–	25	19	3	0
June, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			72	–	4	11	2	0
,, . .	Ballysodare, . .	–	–		—			48	–	4	16	0	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	586	–	58	12	0	0	48	–	4	11	0	0
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	3,936	–	393	12	0	0	34	1	3	9	2	0
,, . .	Foxford, . . .	–	–		—			138	–	13	14	0	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	–	–		—			187	–	14	1	2	0
,, . .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			120	–	11	19	0	0
,, . .	Limerick, . . .	–	–		—			16	–	1	3	1	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			17	–	1	1	0	0
,, . .	Westport, . . .	–	–		—			53	–	5	1	0	0
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			201	–	23	4	0	0
,, . .	Arklow, . . .	258	–	25	16	0	0	–	–		—		
July, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			78	–	5	2	1	0
,, . .	Ballysodare, . .	–	–		—			50	–	5	0	0	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	150	–	15	0	0	0	54	–	5	1	0	0

APPENDIX No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Holyhead by the Steamers of the London and North-Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875—*continued.*

Dates, and from what Statlons.		White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
		Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
July, . .	Dublin, . . .	3,423	–	342	6	0	0	85	–	8	10	0	0
,, . .	Foxford, . . .	–	–		—			145	–	14	12	0	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	–	–		—			140	–	13	1	0	0
,, . .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			108	–	10	14	0	0
,, . .	Limerick, . . .	–	–		—			14	–	1	1	0	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			20	–	1	5	0	0
,, . .	Westport, . . .	–	–		—			40	–	3	18	1	0
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			190	–	21	6	0	0
August, . .	Ballina, . . .	–	–		—			17	–	1	8	1	0
,, . .	Ballysodare, . .	–	–		—			17	–	1	14	0	0
,, . .	Cork, . . .	–	–		—			10	–	0	19	0	0
,, . .	Galway, . . .	–	–		—			6	–	0	9	3	0
,, . .	Sligo, . . .	–	–		—			3	–	0	7	2	0
,, . .	Westport, . . .	–	–		—			63	–	6	1	0	0
,, . .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			39	–	4	3	0	0
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	2,482	–	248	4	0	0	15	–	1	10	0	0
September, .	Athlone, . . .	12	–	0	18	0	0	–	–		—		
,, .	Ballinasloe, . .	11	–	0	16	2	0	–	–		—		
,, .	Dublin, . . .	549	–	54	18	0	0	–	–		—		
,, .	Galway, . . .	10	–	0	15	0	0	1	–	0	1	0	0
,, .	Killarney, . .	–	–		—			1	–	0	0	3	16
,, .	Roscommon, . .	12	–	1	4	0	0	–	–		—		
,, .	Foxford, . . .	1	–	0	2	0	0	–	–		—		
,, .	Westport, . .	–	–		—			3	–	0	5	2	0
,, .	Youghal, . . .	–	–		—			1	–	0	2	1	0
October, . .	Ballinasloe, . .	2	–	0	3	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Dublin, . . .	657	–	65	14	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Foxford, . . .	2	–	0	4	0	0	–	–		—		
,, . .	Galway, . . .	6	–	0	9	0	0	–	–		—		
November, .	Dublin, . . .	832	–	83	4	0	0	–	–		—		
December, .	,, . . .	376	–	37	12	0	0	–	–		—		
	Total, .	22,247	10	2,223	1	2	0	2,990	27	395	3	2	2

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Holyhead by the Steamers of the London and North-Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwts.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
GREENORE:												
January, ...	93	–	7	2	2	0	–	–		—		
February, ...	89	–	6	7	1	0	–	–		—		
March, ...	2	–	0	2	3	0	3	1	0	2	3	13
April, ...	–	–		—			5	5	0	12	1	9
May, ...	–	–		—			52	5	4	11	0	0
June, ...	2,077	–	207	14	0	0	320	1	30	13	1	1
July, ...	3,089	–	308	19	0	16	481	–	47	11	3	18
August, ...	3,839	–	383	14	2	0	–	–		—		
September, . . .	786	1	76	2	2	6	–	–		—		
October, ...	173	–	12	3	0	0	–	–		—		
November, ...	175	–	12	10	1	19	–	–		—		
December, ...	58	–	4	7	0	0	–	–		—		
Total, . . .	10,381	1	1,019	3	0	13	861	12	83	11	1	13

Gross weight.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Liverpool by the Steamers of the Dublin and Liverpool Screw Steam Packet Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes and Barrels.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
DUBLIN:												
March, . . .	–	–		—			13	–	1	7	2	7
June, . . .	194	–	19	8	0	0	–	–		—		
July, . . .	208	–	20	16	0	0	–	–		—		
August, . . .	10	–	1	0	0	0	–	–		—		
October, . . .	317	–	31	14	3	0	–	–		—		
November, . .	185	–	18	10	1	0	–	–		—		
December, . .	13	–	1	6	0	0	–	–		—		
Total, .	927	–	92	15	0	0	13		1	7	2	7

Gross weight.

APPENDIX, No. 9.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to England by the Steamers of the Great Western Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Stations.		White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
		Boxes.	Baskets.					Boxes.	Baskets.				
1875.				Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
January,	Ennis,	1	–	0	1	2	0	–	–		—		
,,	Limerick,	96	–	8	17	0	0	–	–		—		
,,	Waterford,	6	8	1	2	1	4	–	–		—		
February,	Limerick,	4	–	0	7	0	0	–	–		—		
,,	Foynes,	1	–	0	2	0	0	11	–	0	19	1	0
,,	Thomastown,	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	0	0
,,	Kilkenny,	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	2	0
,,	Waterford,	3	15	1	11	2	11	179	–	11	10	2	27
March,	Thomastown,	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	3	14
,,	Ennis,	–	–		—			4	–	0	8	2	0
,,	Kilkenny,	–	–		—			7	–	0	7	2	0
,,	Foynes,	–	–		—			106	–	10	14	0	0
,,	Limerick,	2	–	0	2	2	0	24	–	1	14	1	0
,,	Waterford,	3	23	3	1	2	26	382	–	24	9	1	17
April,	Foynes,	–	–		—			302	–	32	11	0	0
,,	Limerick,	–	–		—			93	–	7	19	0	0
,,	Clonmel,	–	1	0	1	0	0	–	–		—		
,,	Thomastown,	–	–		—			2	–	0	2	0	0
,,	Kilkenny,	–	–		—			12	–	1	0	3	0
,,	Waterford,	1	5	0	5	1	26	664	1	44	5	1	14
May,	Kilkenny,	–	–		—			4	–	0	6	3	0
,,	Thomastown,	–	–		—			11	–	0	14	3	0
,,	Limerick,	–	–		—			56	–	5	5	1	0
,,	Foynes,	–	–		—			242	–	24	17	3	0
,,	Waterford,	4	1	0	5	2	0	569	1	55	9	1	14
June,	Foynes,	–	–		—			297	–	32	4	1	0
,,	Limerick,	–	–		—			75	–	6	11	0	0
,,	Kilkenny,	–	–		—			1	–	0	1	1	0
,,	Tipperary,	–	–		—			2	–	0	3	0	0
,,	Thomastown,	–	–		—			7	–	0	7	1	0
,,	Waterford,	88	1	5	11	1	0	619	1	48	11	1	12
July,	Foynes,	–	–		—			666	–	72	0	2	0
,,	Limerick,	–	–		—			67	–	6	0	1	10
,,	Thomastown,	1	–	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	2	1	20
,,	Clonmel,	–	–		—			–	1	0	0	1	0
,,	Waterford,	107	2	5	18	0	10	720	1	56	8	1	21
August,	Foynes,	–	–		—			55	–	5	9	1	0
,,	Limerick,	–	–		—			1	–	0	2	0	0
,,	Waterford,	48	–	2	16	1	14	194	1	13	10	3	16
September,	Limerick,	65	–	4	10	2	0	–	–		—		
,,	Waterford,	119	2	7	11	2	13	1	–	0	2	0	0
October,	Ennis,	30	–	2	1	3	21	–	–		—		
,,	Limerick,	142	–	11	17	1	0	–	–		—		
,,	Waterford,	38	–	2	13	3	0	–	–		—		
November,	Limerick,	216	–	15	19	1	0	–	–		—		
,,	Ennis,	2	–	0	2	3	0	–	–		—		
,,	Waterford,	12	8	1	11	2	26	–	–		—		
December,	Ennis,	6	–	0	8	0	8	–	–		—		
,,	Limerick,	137	–	11	3	0	0	–	–		—		
,,	Waterford,	13	–	0	17	1	20	–	–		—		
	Yearly Total,	1,145	66	89	1	1	11	5,377	7	465	2	1	25

Weight includes that of Packages, but not of Ice.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to the undermentioned Ports by the Steamships of the City of Cork Steam Packet Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Stations.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Barrels.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Cork to Bristol,	1,030	–	103	0	0	0	31	–	3	2	0	0
,, Liverpool,	2,480	70	255	0	0	0	502	–	50	4	0	0
,, Cardiff,	–	4	0	10	0	0	–	–		—		
,, Newport,	–	4	0	10	0	0	–	–		—		
,, Milford,	–	–		—			2	–	0	4	0	0
,, London,	Nil.			—			Nil.			—		
,, Plymouth,	Nil.			—			Nil.			—		
,, Southampton,	Nil.			—			Nil.			—		
Total,	3,510	78	359	0	0	0	535	–	53	10	0	0

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Glasgow by the Mail Steamers of the Belfast and Glasgow Royal Mail Steam Ship Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	Fresh Herrings.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Barrels.				
BELFAST:			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
February,	70	–	5	15	0	0
March,	50	15	6	10	0	0
May,	10	–	1	0	0	0
June,	1,509	602	197	6	0	0
July,	1,213	1,260	219	5	0	0
August,	940	902	122	4	0	0
September,	57	300	51	2	0	0
October,	50	240	49	10	0	0
November,	–	20	2	0	0	0
Total,	3,899	3,339	654	12	0	0

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Liverpool by the Dundalk and Newry Steam Packet Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight supposed about			
	Boxes.	Baskets.				
			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Warrenpoint,	1,751	360	150	0	0	0

Fish never weighed here, taken at 2 cwt. each package.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Glasgow by the Dublin and Glasgow Steam Packet Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dublin to Glasgow.—White or Coarse Fish—1,247 boxes and 1,000 barrels, not weighed.
,, Salmon and Trout, . 1 box and 2 baskets, not weighed.

The barrels were herrings. Boxes not described; some may have been white fish, remainder herrings.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Dublin and Belfast by the Clyde Shipping Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.				
WATERFORD:			Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
November 24,	–	7	0	14	0	0
December 5,	1	–	0	1	0	0
,, 6,	–	11	0	17	0	0
,, 11,	1	–	0	1	0	0
,, 18,	1	–	0	1	0	0
,, 29,	–	18	1	1	0	0
Gross Weight,	3	36	2	15	0	0

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Liverpool by the Steamers of the Belfast Steam Ship Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

From what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Salmon and Trout.		Weight.			
	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	Boxes.	Baskets.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Londonderry,	220	300	40	0	0	0	850	–	85	0	0	0

Above is gross weight.

APPENDIX, No. 9.

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Bristol by the Bristol General Steam Navigation Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Date, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.
	Boxes.	Barrels.	
DUBLIN:			Tons cwt. qrs. lbs.
February 16,	–	2	—
June 15,	–	27	—
„ 29,	–	30	—
July 13,	–	24	—
„ 27,	14	17	—
August 3,	–	10	—
„ 10,	–	16	—
Total,	14	126	—

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Glasgow by the Steamers of the Glasgow and Londonderry Steam Packet Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Date, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.
	Boxes.	Baskets.	
MOVILLE:			Tons cwt. qrs. lbs.
January,	133	–	—
February,	93	–	—
March,	17	–	—
April,	18	–	—
May,	10	4	—
June,	4	–	—
July,	7	–	—
August,	1	–	—
September,	7	1	—
October,	23	–	—
November,	112	–	—
December,	75	–	—
Total,	500	5	—

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Belfast by the Belfast and County Down Railway Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
From Donaghadee,	50	9	2	0
„ Downpatrick,	1,705	16	3	4
„ Dundrum,	0	0	3	0
„ Newcastle, County Down,	97	8	1	20
Total,	1,853	15	1	24

NOTE.—Above includes weight of packages.

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Liverpool by the Steamers of the Sligo Steam Navigation Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
From Sligo—1,994 bags 27 casks Mussels,	199	8	0	0
„ „ 1,045 „ 13 „ Winkles,	110	10	0	0
„ „ 7 „ 56 „ Oysters,	11	2	0	0
Lifted along coast of Donegal—270 barrels, 59 boxes, 97 creels of Fish—say Lobsters, Crabs, and Fish,	50	0	0	0
Total,	371	0	0	0

	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
Sligo—63½ boxes Salmon,	6	7	0	0

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Whitehaven by the Steamer "South-Western" of the Ardrossan Shipping Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Date, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
BELFAST—14th January,	1 cask,	0	11	2	0
„ 21st „	10 packages,	0	5	0	0
„ 3rd June,	2 bundles,	0	1	2	0
Total,		0	18	0	0

APPENDIX, No. 9—*continued.*

RETURN of FISH conveyed to Ardrossan by the Steamer "Caledonian" of the Ardrossan Shipping Company, during the year ending 31st December, 1875.

Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.				Dates, and from what Station.	White or Coarse Fish.		Weight.			
BELFAST:	Boxes.	Barrels.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.	BELFAST—*continued.*	Boxes.	Barrels.	Tons	cwt.	qrs.	lbs.
June 11, C. D. R.	9	–	0	14	2	0							
,, 16, ,,	11	–	0	19	1	0	July 30, C. D. R.	10	–	0	17	2	0
,, 18, ,,	40	–	3	8	0	0	August 4, ,,	34	4	2	16	2	0
			2	9	0	0				0	9	0	0
,, 23, ,,	29	9	0	18	0	0	,, 11, ,,	–	11	1	13	0	0
			3	16	2	0	,, 16, ,,	–	18	2	14	0	0
,, 25, ,,	47	28	2	18	3	0	,, 18, ,,	–	80	12	5	0	0
,, 30, ,,	–	82	7	18	2	0	,, 20, ,,	22	66	2	0	0	0
			1	12	0	0				8	18	0	0
July 2, ,,	18	13	1	11	3	0	,, 20, ,,	–	30	4	10	0	0
,, 7, ,,	62	27	5	3	2	0	,, 23, ,,	–	33	4	19	0	0
			2	15	0	0	,, 25, ,,	23	8	1	19	3	0
			5	7	0	0				1	4	0	0
,, 9, ,,	59	44	4	12	0	0	,, 30, ,,	–	74	11	2	0	0
			2	13	0	0							
,, 14, ,,	29	6	0	13	2	0	Sept. 8, ,,	11	–	0	19	0	0
,, 14, ,,	4	–	0	7	0	0	,, 10, ,,	9	–	0	15	1	0
,, 16, ,,	–	7	0	14	0	0	,, 13, ,,	–	23	3	9	0	0
			2	2	0	0	,, 15, ,,	23	2	2	3	3	0
,, 23, ,,	21	12	1	18	0	0				0	6	0	0
			1	11	0	0				0	17	0	0
,, 28, ,,	18	9	0	15	0	0	,, 12, ,,	10	19	2	17	0	0

KINSALE MACKEREL FISHERY, 1875.

ABSTRACT of RETURNS furnished and authenticated by the Chief Officer of Coast Guard at Kinsale, during year 1875.

DATE.	Number of Boxes of six score.	Average Price per Box of 6 score.			Total Amount Realized.			Observations.
		£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*	
21st February,	83	3	0	0	249	0	0	
28th ,,	33	3	5	0	107	5	0	
7th March,	10	3	5	0	32	10	0	
14th ,,	3	3	10	0	10	10	0	
21st ,,	–		–			–		
28th ,,	–		–			–		States fishing very light—impossible to get quantity taken.
4th April,	500	2	10	0	1,250	0	0	
11th ,,	5,600	1	17	0	10,360	0	0	
18th ,,	–		–			–		
25th ,,	11,000	0	14	0	7,700	0	0	
2nd May,	18,700	0	15	0	14,025	0	0	
8th ,,	12,191	0	12	6	7,619	7	6	
15th ,,	15,767	0	7	3¾	5,762	11	0	Fish sold cheap for want of boxes to pack them in, and steam vessels to take them away scarce.
22nd ,,	4,970	0	12	6½	3,118	2	6	
29th ,,	13,136	0	12	3¾	8,065	5	0	
5th June,	11,881	0	12	4½	7,355	1	6	
12th ,,	4,200	0	15	0	3,150	0	0	
19th ,,	1,500	0	12	0	900	0	0	
26th ,,	1,000	0	8	0	400	0	0	
3rd July,	4,640	0	3	11½	915	10	0	
10th ,,	1,350	0	3	6	236	5	0	
17th ,,	8,000	0	3	3	1,300	0	0	
24th ,,	65	0	3	2¾	10	10	0	
31st ,,	5,200	0	3	3½	855	0	0	
7th August,	1,700	0	1	2½	102	18	4	
14th ,,	–		–			–		
21st ,,	4	0	4	6	0	18	0	
Total,	121,533		–		73,524	13	10	

Appendix, No. 10.—Abstract o

Substance of Queries issued to Boards of Conservators.	Replies received from Boards of Conservators.	
	1. Dublin.	2. Wexford.
1. What is the general state of the Salmon Fisheries in this District?	1. Slightly improving.	1. Rod fishing fallen off considerably since last year; net fishing on the increase.
2. Has the take of salmon throughout the district been more or less productive in 1875 than in 1874, and to what is attributed the increase or diminution?	2. About the same.	2. Less productive. No cause can be attributed, except that once the netting begins no fish can get up the river until it ceases.
3. What was the average price obtained for salmon last year by the captors? (This has no reference to price obtained by the dealers in salmon.) What was the highest price given for salmon last season? What was the lowest price?	3. 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 5*s.* per lb. 8*d.* per lb.	3. 2*s.* 9*d.* per lb. 1*s.* 3*d.* per lb. Do.
4. What proportion of the entire capture in your district is exported, and what proportion purchased for home consumption?	4. Very little exported.	4. The principal portion exported. A very small portion purchased for home consumption.
5. What is the amount of protection rendered during the present close season of 1875, as compared with preceding season of 1874?	5. About the same.	5. The same.
6. Has the quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers in your district been greater or less as compared with preceding year, 1874?	6. About the same.	6. Less.
7. About what period do the salmon commence to spawn in the several rivers in your district? What are the greatest spawning months? and when is spawning over? and generally where are the most important spawning grounds situated?	7. November. The greatest spawning month is November. Spawning over about Christmas Day. Between Ballymore Eustace and Kilcullen.	7. In November, December, and January. Spawning goes on till March. In the Derreen and Derry rivers and head waters of the River Slaney.
8. Are there any streams which are suitable for spawning now unproductive in consequence of obstructions? If so, state where and nature of obstruction.	8. The River Liffey above Pollaphuca.	8. None.
9. At what period of the year, in each river in your district, are the first clean fish taken? When do the grilse begin to run? When are the spent fish well out of the river? and when does the great bulk of the fry go to sea? Has the quantity of fry descending this year been observably greater or less than usual?	9. January. Grilse begin to run in June. Spent fish are well out of the river in February. January and May. About the same.	9. In March. Grilse begin to run in June and July. Spent fish are well out of the river about middle of April. January and February. The same.
10. During the descent of the fry to the sea, is angling for trout prohibited by any of the proprietors of fisheries, or is it carried on during these months, and does much destruction of fry take place?	10. Angling under pretence of trout, perch, or pike fishing is practised throughout the year, uninterfered with by the proprietors, and considerable quantities of fry are taken or destroyed.	10. No. Carried on during these months.
11. At what period of the year do the fish begin to be discoloured, or to get heavy in spawn; and what is the general opinion as to the proper season for angling in your district?	11. The end of September. From the 1st February to the 31st October, is considered the proper season for angling.	11. About the beginning of November. It is the universal opinion amongst the Conservators and the anglers that the month of October, or a large part of it, ought to be opened for angling.
12. Have you reason to suppose that many spent fish have been destroyed hitherto in the months of February or March, and full fish in the month of October by anglers?	12. No.	12. Great quantities are destroyed by anglers in March. None in October.
13. Are you aware of any change having taken place in regard to the period of the season when the salmon in your district is in best order, whether earlier or later than heretofore? If so, state particulars.	13. No change.	13. No change observed.
14. Is there any increase in the average size of the spring salmon or the peale. Give average weight of salmon and peale in the season 1875, as far as practicable?	14. No increase.	14. Yes, in spring salmon. Average weight of spring salmon 18 lbs.; peale 5 lbs.
15. Are there any pollutions or poisonous matter entering the rivers in your district? If so, state the particular cases.	15. Yes; the gas and chemical works on the North and South Quays of the tideway of the River Liffey.	15. No.
16. Have offences against the Fishery Laws increased or diminished?	16. Fishing for salmon without licence—with rods in the rivers, and draft-nets on the sea coast, under pretence of fishing for other fish than salmon—is on the increase—particularly rod fishing.	16. Diminished.
17. Give a list of the fish passes built in your district.	17. At the weirs of Island-bridge; Newholland, Lucan; the Salmon Leap cascade; and the Temple Mills weir.	17. None.
18. Where would fish passes be practicable and advantageous?	18. Over all the obstructions in this district; but their advantage in many situations is doubtful—as they would, if not protected, act as fish-traps for the poachers.	18. At Kilcarberry, St. John's, Ardresden, Tullow, Rathvilly, and Baltinglass mills.
19. Have gratings been attached to mill-leads, or other artificial channels, in conformity with the 32 Vic., cap. 9, since last Report? and, if so, specify the particular cases, and whether at head or tail races, or both.	19. None.	19. Yes; except at Foxe's mills, on the Derreen river.
20. What instances and nature of precautions have been adopted at mills other than that prescribed by the late Act, to prevent the destruction of fish, since last Report?	20. None.	20. None.
21. Where and by whom have fixed engines been used in 1875?	21. None.	21. None.
22. Can you give a list of the prosecutions instituted by the Conservators during the year 1875?	22. None.	22. William Wilds, fishing in annual close season; acquitted. James Nangle, same; same. James Devereux, fishing in weekly close season; same. John Cosgrave, do.; do. Philip Hendrick, do.; do. John King, illegal fishing; do. Philip Murphy, sen., do.; do. Philip Murphy, jun., do.; do. Robert Cosgrave, taking unclean salmon; convicted; appealed; conviction varied to £1, which was paid. Walter Carley, sen., scaring salmon; acquitted. Richard Doyle, not having open the sluice of his mill; convicted before the Magistrates; decision reversed by the Barrister. David Bolger, neglecting to have gratings erected at his mill; convicted; fine paid. John Wright, fishing without licence; acquitted. Thomas Kelly, using a spear; convicted; fine not paid; appealed. James M'Ardel, do.; do.; do. James Kavanagh, aiding in above; acquitted. William Warren (two cases), neglecting to have gratings erected at his mill; convicted; fines paid. Walter Malone, do.; do.; do. Byrnes and Smith in Co., do.; do. do. —— Donohoe, do.; do.; do. —— Doyle (two cases), neglecting to keep open the sluice of her mill; do.; do. Walter Fox, neglecting to have gratings erected at his mill; do.; appealed. James Fitzgerald (two cases), using a gaff; do.; fine paid. R. Dowling, using a spear; do.; do.
23. Can you give a list of prosecutions for fishery offences instituted by others, stating whether by Constabulary or other persons, during 1875?	23. One by the Constabulary at Newbridge, county Kildare, for using an otter in the River Liffey. This case was conducted by the Clerk of Conservators for the police, and a fine of £4 imposed. The defendant went to gaol for a month rather than pay.	23. One by Constabulary at Ballycarny.
24. Are there any new modes of fishing for salmon adopted in your district? If so, what are they, and where used?	24. Yes; guns are used for killing salmon in this district—both in the rivers and in the open sea, off Wicklow Head.	24. None.
25. What is the number of water-bailiffs employed by Conservators?	25. The Inspector of Water-bailiffs, his assistant, and three bailiffs.	25. One Inspector and nine water-bailiffs.
26. What is the number employed in district by private individuals?	26. One by Mr. E. Cane, for a few months during the autumn, to prevent anglers and others from intruding on his portion of the River Liffey. Also the Swords Angling Club employ a man throughout the year for like purpose on the Swords river.	26. None.
27. For what length of time employed?	27. From three to twelve months.	27. The Inspector and two water-bailiffs during the year; seven additional bailiffs during the annual close season.
28. Are there any proprietors who contribute towards protection? if so, where and how much?	28. None.	28. None.
29. What is the rate of wages paid by the Conservators?	29. From £61 to £5 per annum, according to the length of time and nature of duty required.	29. The Inspector £1 4*s.*; the bailiffs 12*s.* each per week.
30. Are there any suggestions or general observations with which the Conservators may be disposed to favour the Inspectors with reference to the Salmon Fisheries *in your district*—whether as to the rate of licence duty upon fishing engines or other matters?	30. The Conservators are of opinion that if all the Fishery Districts in Ireland returned to the 10*s.* licence duty on single salmon rods there would be no diminution of funds from such a change, as the present rate of a £1 licence duty on a salmon rod is so extensively evaded that angling without licence seems to be the rule and the payment of it the exception.	30. In the Slaney the netting is carried on to such an extent that the upper proprietors—not getting what they consider a fair share of the fishing—are apathetic about preservation. During the summer no fish can get past Enniscorthy draft; and the Conservators would press upon the Inspectors the propriety of their passing a by-law to remove same.

STATEMENTS from Boards of Conservators.

Replies received from Boards of Conservators.

3. WATERFORD.	4. LISMORE.	5. CORK.
1. Improved. The rivers are well stocked with fish, and poaching is considerably decreased.	1. The fisheries have considerably deteriorated, owing to the drift net fishing in the tidal waters, and which does not allow the salmon up, and also from the river being poached with nets and strokehauls, which cannot be possibly prevented by bailiffs only; and unless the Constabulary in their respective districts be directed to check this growing evil, the upper portion of the river will become much deteriorated.	1. A very fair quantity of salmon in the Rivers Lee, Bandon, and Argideen during the season of 1875. In the tidal portion there was a large take—larger than for some years past. In the upper waters the take was small, although there was plenty of fish.
2. Consequent on the dryness of the season there were a good many more salmon taken in 1874.	2. Less productive, owing to the above causes.	2. The take in the tidal waters much more than in 1874. The take in the Bandon River by nets in 1875 has been more, and by rods less than in 1874.
3. 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 8*d.* to 10*d.* for peale.	3. About 1*s.* 6*d.* a lb. 2*s.* 2*d.* a lb. 6*d.* a lb.	3. About 1*s.* 6*d.* a lb. 2*s.* 6*d.* a lb. 10*d.* a lb.
4. Cannot say.	4. About two-thirds exported, and the remainder bought for home consumption.	4. Very little kept for home use; nearly all exported. Fish taken by rods are nearly all sold at home. In Bandon Division all taken by nets is exported; also a large proportion of the take by rods.
5. The Constabulary are rendering great assistance in the protection of the spawning rivers, but cannot give the amount of protection rendered as compared with 1874.	5. The Conservators of this district have occasionally largely increased water-bailiffs this season.	5. The Conservators, expending their money on the rivers, and assisted well by the Cork Anglers' Club. In the Bandon River the amount of protection has been about the same as previous year.
6. The breeding fish are considered to be more numerous this season than in 1874, and particularly in the main rivers, as there were few floods to bring them up the tributaries.	6. Reports from water-bailiffs speak of a large increase of "breeding" fish this year in the tributaries as compared with preceding year.	6. Greater than in 1874.
7. November, December, and January. Spawning, as a rule, is over in February; but in some instances they are as late as April.	7. Late in October. Principal spawning months are December and January.	7. October, November, and December; middle of January, all about Macroom. The greatest spawning months are December and January. Spawning grounds are to be found in all shallows. In the Bandon River salmon commence to spawn about the middle of November, and in the Argideen later.
8. Not aware of any.	8. Not aware of any.	8. None.
9. In February. Grilse begin to run in June and July. Spent fish are well out of the river in April; but a great deal depends on floods in April and May. Greater than ever.	9. New fish taken early in February. Grilse begin to run latter end of May. Spent fish are well out of river in March. Fry go to sea end of April. Observably less.	9. In spite of bailiffs some salmon are taken in February by poachers. About 1st June, end of February and April. Grilse begin to run about the end of May. Spent fish are not well out of the river before April. The middle of March. Greater than usual.
10. No; and the consequence is that thousands of fry are killed by rod fishers.	10. Trout fishing not prohibited; very little destruction of fry.	10. Not prevented in any part of the district; consequently much destruction takes place.
11. About the months of July and August. From 1st February to September is considered the proper season for angling.	11. Fish begin to get discoloured about August. Get heavy in spawn about end of October. Proper season for angling from February to September.	11. About the middle of June—from that out. The Lee is a very early river. The season which in the general opinion is best adapted for fishing in the Lee and its tributaries are the months of February, March, April, and sometimes May, according to weather; after these months it is of very little use. October should be closed. In the Bandon River the fish begin to be discoloured in October. The present season in River Lee is considered proper.
12. To a very great extent, in their descent, in mill-wheels. Few, if any, taken in the month of October.	12. In consequence of the few cross lines now in use the destruction of spent fish is comparatively nothing.	12. Very few, hardly any; but full fish (a great many) are destroyed in October. In the Bandon River many spent fish have been destroyed in March by anglers. In latter river the number of full fish destroyed in October by anglers is not great.
13. Salmon are in good order from March to July.	13. Not aware of any change.	13. No change remarked.
14. A very considerable increase has been observed in spring salmon. Peale 5 to 8 lbs.	14. Some very weighty salmon were captured this season—48 lbs. and 36 lbs. in weight. Average size of salmon about 12 lbs., and peale 4 lbs.	14. Increase in size about same as in 1874; but a few have been taken over the average size in River Lee—one weighed 39 lbs. In Bandon River no increase in 1875. A few over the average size have been taken—one, 38 lbs. in weight. Peale about same as in 1874 in Rivers Lee and Bandon.
15. Yes. At Clonmel, Ballymacarberry, Ardfinnan, and Thurles.	15. Not aware of any.	15. None.
16. Offences greatly diminished.	16. Offences certainly increased.	16. Offences increased—except in Bandon River, where they have diminished.
17. Two at Cahir and one at Clonmel.	17. None.	17. No new ones built. Those built already are in Waterworks weir, and on Carrigrohan and Ballincollig weirs. In Bandon Division, on Bandon, Murragh, and Dunmanway weirs.
18. At Mrs. Bishop's mill, on the Aherlow river; and at Clogheen, on the River Tar.	18. —	18. Waterworks weir, where the present pass is perfectly useless. It would prove very advantageous if a proper one was there. The pass on Carrigrohan weir is nearly completed, having undergone alterations from the old stone ladder. In Bandon River none required.
19. Some have been put up at tail-races, but not generally, and all at head-races.	19. Gratings have been attached to the mill-races at Dr. Barry's mill at Kanturk.	19. Gratings have been put up at head-race of Belmont mills, near Crookstown, since last report. Very much required at Mr. Cantillon's mills, Carrigaline, where there is a large quantity of fry destroyed.
20. None.	20. Not aware of any.	20. None.
21. —	21. John Litton, esq., one bag net, Ballycotton; Hon. C. W. Moore Smyth, one stake net, Ballinatray; William Hennessy and John Neill, one stake net, Scart; N. T. Foley, esq., two box nets, Lismore.	21. Sampson French, esq., stake weir, Cuskinny. Captain Samuel Hodder, bag net, Ringabella, Carrigaline.
22. About 54 convictions. Amount of fines imposed about £117.	22. —	22, 23. —
23. About 40. Amount of fines imposed included in reply to No. 22.	23. The Coast Guards at Youghal had prosecutions; the Constabulary also had some.	24. None.
24. No.	24. Not aware of any.	25. During the summer there were six. Since the season closed there were eighteen; and sometimes, when wanted, twenty would be employed, besides four or five under Anglers' Club. In the Bandon River, three permanently, others when required.
25. This varies according to the season of the year. In winter there are three times the number employed during the spawning season.	25. There were twelve permanent water-bailiffs employed throughout the year, and three additional men at Youghal to assist the Coast Guards during the greater part of the open season. There were also thirty-one extra water-bailiffs during the spawning season, and six more employed by private gentlemen.	26. About three. In the Bandon River none.
26. None.	26. Six, as stated in reply to last query.	27. The winter bailiffs about three months. There are six employed all the year. In Bandon River, employed when required.
27. —	27. Nearly all the year.	28. None, excepting Sir George C. Colthurst, Sir Augustus Warren, and Colonel Forster. A great many subscribers to the Anglers' Club and several of the riparian proprietors from £1 to £5, donations.
28. No.	28. Yes; Mr. Nelson T. Foley. On the tidal portion of the river. Cannot state exactly how much, but believe he expends a considerable amount annually.	29. From 15*s.* to 12*s.* per week to bailiffs in the tidal portion. In the upper waters 10*s.*, excepting two in Macroom, who are paid 12*s.* per week.
29. £3 a month to some, £2 to others.	29. Average from 10*s.* to 12*s.* per week.	30. That the present rate of licence duty on rods, £1, should be continued. That the rate, £3, on draft and drift nets is much too low for the large quantity of fish taken by such engines. As to the drift nets, the present licence duty is far too small, taking into account the very great quantity of fish captured by them, and their mode of fishing is most injurious to the rivers. That it is impossible to protect the upper waters in the spawning season from poachers under the present system of employing local bailiffs; in many instances it is a useless waste of money. Some few, in a body, do well, otherwise it is money thrown away.*
30. No.	30. The Conservators consider licence duty should be increased on all "fixed engines;" that efficient passes should be constructed in Glandelane and Gurteen weirs; and that the "Queen's Gap," in the Lismore weir, should be considerably improved.	

* There was a very great check to poaching during the presence of the Gunboat "Orwell" in the tidal waters; otherwise it has been looked on as a matter of impossibility to stop illegal netting altogether in the close season.

Appendix, No. 10.—Abstract

Substance of Queries issued to Boards of Conservators.	Replies received from Boards of Conservators.	
	6¹. Skibbereen.	6². Bantry.
1. What is the general state of the Salmon Fisheries in this district?	1. Rather below the average.	1. Not good.
2. Has the take of salmon throughout the district been more or less productive in 1875 than in 1874, and to what is attributed the increase or diminution?	2. Less. Cause not clearly ascertained. Some attribute it to the recent extension of the net season in this river.	2. More productive.
3. What was the average price obtained for salmon last year by the captors? (This has no reference to price obtained by the dealers in salmon.) What was the highest price given for salmon last season? What was the lowest price?	3. 5½*d.* a lb. 7*d.* a lb. 5½*d.* a lb.	3. 6*d.* per lb. 7*d.* per lb. 6*d.* per lb.
4. What proportion of the entire capture in your district is exported, and what proportion purchased for home consumption?	4. This depends a good deal on amount of capture—home consumption being generally the same every year; on an average, about one-half.	4. Nearly all exported.
5. What is the amount of protection rendered during the present close season of 1875, as compared with preceding season of 1874?	5. The same.	5. The same.
6. Has the quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers in your district been greater or less as compared with preceding year, 1874?	6. Rather less.	6. About the same.
7. About what period do the salmon commence to spawn in the several rivers in your district? What are the greatest spawning months? and when is spawning over? and generally where are the most important spawning grounds situated?	7. Salmon commence to spawn about the middle of November. The greatest spawning months are December and January. Spawning is over about the beginning of February. Spawning grounds extend over several miles of the river.	7. November and December are the greatest spawnin months; and about the end of January spawning over.
8. Are there any streams which are suitable for spawning now unproductive in consequence of obstructions? If so, state where and nature of obstruction.	8. None.	8. None.
9. At what period of the year, in each river in your district, are the first clean fish taken? When do the grilse begin to run? When are the spent fish well out of the river? and when does the great bulk of the fry go to sea? Has the quantity of fry descending this year been observably greater or less than usual?	9. Ilen and Rowry, latter end of June. Grilse begin to run 1st of March. In April—About the same.	9. A few in June. ——. Spent fish well out of t river in April and May. ——. Less.
10. During the descent of the fry to the sea, is angling for trout prohibited by any of the proprietors of fisheries, or is it carried on during these months, and does much destruction of fry take place?	10. The destruction of fry by angling is not worth speaking of.	10. Angling is not carried on during these months.
11. At what period of the year do the fish begin to be discoloured, or to get heavy in spawn; and what is the general opinion as to the proper season for angling in your district?	11. The present season appears to suit the requirements of the River Ilen and district generally.	11. Some in October. The 1st of November is co sidered the proper time to cease angling.
12. Have you reason to suppose that many spent fish have been destroyed hitherto in the months of February or March, and full fish in the month of October by anglers?	12. No. The season does not open until May.	12. No.
13. Are you aware of any change having taken place in regard to the period of the season when the salmon in your district is in best order, whether earlier or later than heretofore? If so, state particulars.	13. None.	13. None.
14. Is there any increase in the average size of the spring salmon or the peale? Give average weight of salmon and peale in the season 1875, as far as practicable.	14. None. Average about 6 lbs.	14. Salmon about 7 lbs.
15. Are there any pollutions or poisonous matter entering the rivers in your district? If so, state the particular cases.	15. None.	15. No.
16. Have offences against the Fishery Laws increased or diminished?	16. About the same as hitherto.	16. The same.
17. Give a list of the fish passes built in your district.	17. One on the mill-dam of the Ilen River.	17. None.
18. Where would fish passes be practicable and advantageous?	18. —	18. At Dunnamark.
19. Have gratings been attached to mill-leads, or other artificial channels, in conformity with the 32 Vic., cap. 9, since last Report? and, if so, specify the particular cases, and whether at head or tail races, or both.	19. Yes, at tail-race of Loriga mills.	19. At Carrigboy.
20. What instances and nature of precautions have been adopted at mills other than that prescribed by the late Act, to prevent the destruction of fish, since last Report?	20. None.	20. None.
21. Where and by whom have fixed engines been used in 1875?	21. None.	21. None.
22. Can you give a list of the prosecutions instituted by the Conservators during the year 1875?	22. None.	22. John Costigan, for using a spear; acquitted. Jol Sullivan, ditto; convicted; fined £4; appeal lodg to the Bantry Sessions in January. Michael Shan han, ditto; ditto; ditto.
23. Can you give a list of prosecutions for fishery offences instituted by others, stating whether by Constabulary or other persons, during 1875?	23. Six by the Constabulary; but cannot give particulars.	23. None.
24. Are there any new modes of fishing for salmon adopted in your district? If so, what are they, and where used?	24. None.	24. None.
25. What is the number of water-bailiffs employed by Conservators?	25. One.	25. Four.
26. What is the number employed in district by private individuals?	26. One on the Rowry; partly paid by private individuals.	26. Two by the Earl of Bantry.
27. For what length of time employed?	27. Three months.	27. From June to February.
28. Are there any proprietors who contribute towards protection? if so, where, and how much?	28. None, save as in No. 26.	28. No.
29. What is the rate of wages paid by the Conservators?	29. 10*s.* per week.	29. 6*s.* per week.
30. Are there any suggestions or general observations with which the Conservators may be disposed to favour the Inspectors with reference to the Salmon Fisheries *in your district*—whether as to the rate of licence duty upon fishing engines or other matters?	30. —	30. None.

ATEMENTS from Boards of Conservators—*continued.*

Replies received from Boards of Conservators.

6³. KENMARE.	7. KILLARNEY.	8. LIMERICK.
Fair.	1. In no part of the district as good as last season. On the River Maine, the worst season for many years. Some of the net-owners did not clear their expenses. This is mainly attributable to the poisoning with lime on the Brown Flesk, by which the fry are destroyed in quantities, and also killed by anglers (for trout) in March and April. Some prosecutions for poisoning were had at the suit of the Constabulary at Castleisland—not only on this river but the Smerlough (the latter is in the Limerick District). The parties convicted appealed; but the convictions were afterwards affirmed. A newly appointed bailiff had three convictions, and appeals lodged in two; one was affirmed, the other is still pending.	1. Very satisfactory.
More productive. Caused chiefly by the iryness of the season, which prevented the ish going to the rivers; and the sweepers nd draft nets had a better season. 6½*d.* per lb. 7*d.* per lb. 6*d.* per lb.	2. Less in 1875. Can give no particular reason, except for the River Maine; for which see answer to last query.	2. The take of spring fish was more productive —that of peale about the same.
Nineteen-twentieths exported and one-wentieth for home consumption.	3. 10*d.* per lb. 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 6*d.* per lb.	3. About 1*s.* 9*d.* per lb. for spring fish, and 8*d.* for peale. 2*s.* 8*d.* spring fish; 10*d.* peale. 1*s.* spring fish; 8*d.* peale.
About the same.	4. Nearly all exported. About five per cent. kept for home consumption.	4. The greater portion is exported.
In some rivers less and in others more. The decrease in some is attributable to the ystem of poisoning, which is very prevalent n this district.	5. The same. The staff of bailiffs about the same. The police have rendered most valuable services—especially at Castleisland, Beaufort, and Annescall stations. The Conservators are sorry to be obliged again to complain of the inefficiency of the police at the Farranfore Station, which is quite close to and in view of both the Rivers Maine and Brown Flesk; and the greater part of the poisoning takes place within less than a mile of the barrack, and no prosecutions instituted. Indeed lime has been seen in pools within a quarter of a mile of the station. In this district the portion of the fines coming the Conservators is, as suggested to the Board by Major Hayes, handed over to the police who prosecute, which is an inducement for efficiency; but in most cases the farmers, who are much greater poachers than the labourers, send their sons and servant boys, who, if convicted, have no goods off which to levy the fines, and they go to gaol.	5. The amount in both years was about the same.
Salmon commence to spawn about the niddle of November. The greatest spawn-ng months are November and December. Spawning is over 1st January. The tribu-aries and upper parts of the rivers.	6. Much less, but cannot assign any special cause except its being a generally bad season.	6. About the same in both years. Quantity in 1875–6 very large.
—	7. Salmon commence to spawn about November. The greatest spawning months are November and December. Spawning over about February. The best spawning beds are the Rivers Gidaugh, Guisten, Loe, Aulanookera, Flesk, Brown Flesk, Caragh, Begh, Inny, and Fartha—the two latter are near Waterville—and the tributaries running into the Waterville and Commaragh Lakes.	7. About the month of December. The greatest spawning months are December and January. Spawning over about the end of January. At Castleconnell, Killaloe, the Nenagh River, and Mulcaire River.
May. Grilse begin to run about the 10th of June. Spent fish are well out of the iver about the middle of March. The beginning of May. Less this year.	8. None.	8. Know of none.
. It is carried on during those months; not much destruction of fry.	9. In the Laune, Caragh, and Waterville Rivers in November; in the Maine and Brown Flesk early in May; but the spent fish are nearly all killed by anglers. Grilse begin to run as early as May. Spent fish are well out in April all over the district. In May. Less than in 1874.	9. About the month of February. Grilse begin to run at the end of May. Spent fish are well out at the close of April. In April and May.
. The beginning of October. From 1st April to October is considered the proper eason for angling.	10. No. Angling is carried on during these months, and much destruction must necessarily take place, especially in the Rivers Maine and Brown Flesk, in March and April.	10. No. It is carried on during these months, but very little destruction takes place.
. Yes.	11. This varies very much according as the rivers are early or late ones. The season as at present fixed gives general satisfaction, with the exception of that fixed for the Rivers Maine and Brown Flesk, and the rivers running into the sea between the mouth of the Maine and Dunmore Head.	11. About August. The present season is considered the proper one.
—	12. No; but have no doubt that some are killed by anglers, especially in the Maine and Brown Flesk, as well as fry during the month of March and up to the middle of April.	12. Not many.
. Salmon from 6 lbs. to 12 lbs.; peale rom 3 lbs to 6 lbs.	13. No.	13. No.
. No.	14. The salmon of 1875 have not been as heavy as in 1874; the deficiency is about ten per cent. Salmon about ten lbs.; peale about five lbs.	14. No perceptible increase during the past few years. Average weight in 1875 of spring fish, about 22 lbs.; peale about 7 lbs.
. In the Roughty River offences have increased, but have decreased in other rivers.	15. None, except the poisoning with lime in the Brown Flesk before alluded to. There is hardly any flax grown in the district, and the police are very watchful in preventing any being placed near running streams.	15. No.
. —	16. Offences about the same.	16. The number of persons prosecuted by the Conservators on reports of water-bailiffs in 1875 was 95.
. —	17. None.	17. —
. —	18. At the Flesk mills, near Killarney.	18. —
	19. Believe that the Act of Parliament has been complied with. Our Inspector will visit all the mills as soon as the fry begin to run.	19. Know of none.
. —	20. None.	
	21. James Butler, stone weir, Waterville.	20. None.
. —	22. At the Petty Sessions of Killorglin, Annescall, Castleisland, and Waterville twenty-eight convictions and eleven dismisses. No returns received from the other districts.	
. Simon Lovett, taking poisoned fish; convicted; £5. Eugene Sweeny, do.; do. do. Jude Sweeny, do.; do.; £4. Jude Shea, do.; do.; do.; not paid. Denis Foley, do.; do.; do.; do. Tim Foley, strokehauling; do.; do.; do. John Bell, do.; do.; do.; do. William Bell, do.; not convicted. Maurice Healy, taking poisoned fish; convicted; £5. Maurice Sullivan, do.; do.; £4. William Maybury, do.; do.; 10*s.* Tim Leary, do.; do.; do. Nell Shea, do.; do.; do.; not paid. Tim Shea, do.; do.; do.; do. Con Lehane, do.; do.; 10*s.* Jer Lehane, do.; do.; do. Dan Healy, strokehauling; do.; £4. Con Lehane, jun., taking poisoned fish; acquitted. . Sir Richard Orpen prosecuted a few persons; but they proved an *alibi* and were acquitted.	23. Nine convictions at the suit of the Constabulary and three by the coast-guard, as far as returns have been received. The most valuable assistance was rendered by the Constabulary at Castleisland station, as alluded to in answer to No. 5.	21. Lord Monteagle, four stake-nets, Foynes. John Griffin, one do., Loughill. James Browne, one do., Glin. Knight of Glin, one do., Glin. William Blennerhassett, one do., Shannon Lower. Captain Leslie, two do., Tarbert. Thomas Sandes, two do., Sallow Glen. W. C. Hickie, one do., Killelton. Dr. Wren, two do., Litter. Thomas Boland, one do., Cappa. Synan M'Auliffe, three do., Knock. R. W. C. Reeves, five do., Burrane. Daniel Molony, four do., Bayview. Eliza Hodnett, one do., Knock. Col. Vandeleur, one do., Kilrush. Stephen Cunningham, one do., Ayleroe.
. —	24. None.	22. Not within this space.
. Thirteen.	25. Same as last year. On the Laune, Maine, Brown Flesk, and Caragh Rivers and Lakes, 34; Waterville Rivers and Lakes, 22; Killarney Rivers and Lakes, 20; total, 76.	23. Yes, twenty-four by Constabulary, instructed by the Board of Conservators.
. Nineteen.	26. Same as last year. Messrs. Power and Dodd, 18; Hon. Rowland Winn, 5; James Butler and others at Waterville, 14; Mrs. Breen and Mr. Eagar, 2; total, 39.	24. No.
. About eight months.	27. Most of them for the entire year, and the others only for the spawning season.	25. About 70 between 1st of February and 1st November, and about 120 between 1st November and 1st February.
. No.	28. Sir John Godfrey and Lord Ventry, for the Laune, £10 each; Mahoney, Minors, for the Caragh, £10; Messrs. Dodd and Co., for the district in general, £30; Mr. Butler and others also expend about £30 at Waterville. These sums are not paid to the Conservators; but the four first items are expended by Mr. Dodd for private water-bailiffs.	26. None.
. 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* per week.	29. Varies from £12 to £2.	27. See No. 25.
. There is a difference of opinion regarding duty paid on nets; some are for increasing the duty, others consider it high enough.	30. The Conservators again strongly urge the alteration of the close season for angling in the Rivers Maine and Brown Flesk. That the season for netting should cease on the 31st of August, and that no netting should be permitted above the tidal flow, as defined. They must also express their marked approval of the aid given by the police in carrying out the Fishery Laws all over this district, with the exception alluded to in answer to query No. 5; and they believe a police station near a river is more useful in the way of protection than any number of bailiffs.	28. No.
		29. From 5*s.* to £1 per week.
		30. No.

Appendix, No. 10.—Abstract

Substance of Queries issued to Boards of Conservators.	Replies received from Boards of Conservators.	
	9. Galway.	10[1]. Ballinakill.
1. What is the general state of the Salmon Fisheries in this district?	1. Not satisfactory as to the take of fish, but quite so as to the quantity of fish on the spawning grounds.	1. Not satisfactory.
2. Has the take of salmon throughout the district been more or less productive in 1875 than in 1874, and to what is attributed the increase or diminution?	2. Less productive throughout the district. Cannot tell the cause, unless from an overcrowding of fish on the spawn beds.	2. Less productive.
3. What was the average price obtained for salmon last year by the captors? (This has no reference to price obtained by the dealers in salmon.) What was the highest price given for salmon last season? What was the lowest price?	3. 1*s.* per lb. 2*s.* 4*d.* per lb. 9*d.* per lb.	3. 7*d.* to 8*d.*
4. What proportion of the entire capture in your district is exported, and what proportion purchased for home consumption?	4. About nine-tenths exported; a tenth sold at home.	4. Almost all exported.
5. What is the amount of protection rendered during the present close season of 1875, as compared with preceding season of 1874?	5. About the same.	5. About the same.
6. Has the quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers in your district been greater or less as compared with preceding year, 1874?	6. Fully greater, and bears a very favourable comparison with the decreased take of last fishing season.	6. Considerably less.
7. About what period do the salmon commence to spawn in the several rivers in your district? What are the greatest spawning months? and when is spawning over? and generally where are the most important spawning grounds situated?	7. 18th to 25th November. December and first half of January. By 20th January.	7. 20th November. The greatest spawning month i December. Spawning over about 8th January.
8. Are there any streams which are suitable for spawning now unproductive in consequence of obstructions? If so, state where and nature of obstruction.	8. Very few, excepting Lough Mask stream—the water supply between Loughs Mask and Corrib being cut off for eight months of the year.	8. —
9. At what period of the year, in each river in your district, are the first clean fish taken? When do the grilse begin to run? When are the spent fish well out of the river? and when does the great bulk of the fry go to sea? Has the quantity of fry descending this year been observably greater or less than usual?	9. Early in February. Grilse begin to run about 12th May. Spent fish are well out in middle of April. In May. Less, and under the average.	9. Latter end of April if fished for. Grilse begin t run in June. Spent fish are well out in Apri March and April. Less.
10. During the descent of the fry to the sea, is angling for trout prohibited by any of the proprietors of fisheries, or is it carried on during these months, and does much destruction of fry take place?	10. Prohibited in Galway River, and little destruction to salmon fry in the district.	10. Not prohibited. No fishing carried on.
11. At what period of the year do the fish begin to be discoloured, or to get heavy in spawn; and what is the general opinion as to the proper season for angling in your district?	11. Middle of August. 30th September—except the rivers at Costelloe, Screev, Inver, and Ballinahinch, which are late rivers.	11. September.
12. Have you reason to suppose that many spent fish have been destroyed hitherto in the months of February or March, and full fish in the month of October by anglers?	12. Very few, not many. Overfull fish are returned to the river at Galway in October.	12. Very few.
13. Are you aware of any change having taken place in regard to the period of the season when the salmon in your district is in best order, whether earlier or later than heretofore? If so, state particulars.	13. No change.	13. —
14. Is there any increase in the average size of the spring salmon or the peale? Give average weight of salmon and peale in the season 1875, as far as practicable.	14. None since last year. Average the same.	14. 12 to 14 lbs. 6 to 7 lbs.
15. Are there any pollutions or poisonous matter entering the rivers in your district? If so, state the particular cases.	15. None.	15. —
16. Have offences against the Fishery Laws increased or diminished?	16. Diminished.	16. Increased.
17. Give a list of the fish passes built in your district.	17. None.	17. —
18. Where would fish passes be practicable and advantageous?	18. Between Lough Corrib and Lough Mask.	18. —
19. Have gratings been attached to mill-leads, or other artificial channels, in conformity with the 32 Vic., cap. 9, since last Report? and, if so, specify the particular cases, and whether at head or tail races, or both.	19. Yes, all over district, as enumerated in last report.	19. —
20. What instances and nature of precautions have been adopted at mills, other than that prescribed by the late Act, to prevent the destruction of fish, since last Report?	20. None other necessary.	20. —
21. Where and by whom have fixed engines been used in 1875?	21. By lessees of Galway weirs.	21. —
22. Can you give a list of the prosecutions instituted by the Conservators during the year 1875?	22. —	22. James Gavan, chasing and disturbing fish; con victed; £2 10*s.*; paid. Austin Garvey, fishing with spear; do.; £6; paid. John Gannon, do.; do. £4; not paid. Daniel Grady, do.; do.; 10*s.*; no paid. John Meally, William Lindsey, Patt Coyne Michael Gallagher, using a fixed net without certi ficate; do.; £50 each; not paid. John Joyce Denis Logan, snatching; do.; £4 each; not paid one month in gaol. Maurice Durken, fishing with spear; do.; memorialled, and fine since paid. John Ready, chasing and disturbing fish; do.; 2*s.* 6*d.* paid.
23. Can you give a list of prosecutions for fishery offences instituted by others, stating whether by Constabulary or other persons, during 1875?	23. —	23. —
24. Are there any new modes of fishing for salmon adopted in your district? If so, what are they, and where used?	24. None.	24. —
25. What is the number of water-bailiffs employed by Conservators?	25. The same as last report.	25. Thirty-four.
26. What is the number employed in district by private individuals?	26. Over 200.	26. About sixteen—not quite sure.
27. For what length of time employed?	27. Sixty to seventy throughout the year; the others in November, December, and January.	27. Four all the year; others for close season only.
28. Are there any proprietors who contribute towards protection? if so, where and how much?	28. Messrs. Miller and Co. over £600; Sir Arthur Guinness £10.	28. William Livingstone, Belclare; Lord J. Brown Louisburgh; J. Stott, esq., Aasleagh; M. Henry esq., M.P., Dawros; John Kendal, esq., Ardagh Cannot say how much they contribute.
29. What is the rate of wages paid by the Conservators?	29. £2 to £20.	29. One £5, one £4; others £3, £2, £1 10*s.*
30. Are there any suggestions or general observations with which the Conservators may be disposed to favour the Inspectors, with reference to the Salmon Fisheries *in your district*—whether as to the rate of licence duty upon fishing engines or other matters?	30. None.	30. —

STATEMENTS from Boards of Conservators—*continued.*

Replies received from Boards of Conservators.

10². BANGOR.	11. BALLINA.	12. SLIGO.
1. Much the same as the previous season.	1. Capture less than previous year, but quantity of breeding fish as great.	1. Satisfactory.
2. Almost the same as in 1874.	2. Not so productive. Don't know what to attribute the diminution to.	2. About the same.
3. About 10*d.* per lb. 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 8*d.* per lb.	3. Cannot say. 2*s.* per lb. 8*d.* per lb.	3. Various prices, from 3*s.* down to 8*d.* per lb. Cannot say.
4. Almost all exported.	4. Almost all exported.	4. Almost all exported.
5. Protection by water-bailiffs about the same. The continued gratuitous exertions of the Ballycroy Constabulary have the most beneficial effect in that locality, and it is much to be regretted that the Constabulary generally don't act likewise.	5. By Conservators in 1874, £390; this year, £342. The lessees of Moy Fishery paying besides some £600; Mr. Little, towards the "Rathfran" and "Ballycastle" Rivers, over £60; and Mr. Carnegy, towards the "Easky" River, £15 to £20.	5. Well protected during 1875.
6. Breeding fish have somewhat increased beyond that of 1874, except on the Owenmore River and Lake Carramore tributaries, upon which almost no protection was afforded until January, then too late in the season.	6. Quite as great.	6. Much the same.
7. The latter end of November. December. In some rivers not until the end of January. No place in particular.	7. The end of October. The greatest spawning months are November and December. At Swinford, Crossmolina, Tubbercurry, Ballaghy, Curry, Turlow, Easky, and Rathfran, are the most important spawning districts.	7. First of November. The last fortnight in December is the time of greatest spawning. Spawning is over in January. In the upper waters.
8. Not aware of any.	8. No.	8. None.
9. Carramore Lake and Goolamore River, 16th February in each year. About 1st June. Generally in the district about the 1st of April. April and May. Much about the same as in 1874.	9. In the Moy in February; Easky, in June; Rathfran and Ballycastle, in September. Grilse begin to run in May. Spent fish are well out in April. April and May. Not quite so great.	9. In the Sligo River in January; Ballisodare River in April; Drumcliff River in March. Grilse begin to run in May. Spent fish are well out in April. Bulk of fry descend in April and May. Greater.
10. Angling prohibited in most of the rivers during the descent of fry.	10. Angling for trout is prohibited by a by-law of the Inspectors during the months of April and May, otherwise much destruction would be done to the fry as formerly.	10. Not prohibited. Little or no fry destroyed.
11. Towards the end of September, save in Carramore Lake, where they become discoloured in June. A difference of opinion still exists as to the proper angling season.	11. In August in the Moy, in the other rivers in the district in September and October. The general opinion is that angling should continue, as at present, from 1st February to 15th September.	11. In the inland waters in May. The present season for angling considered fair.
12. None.	12. A great many full fish destroyed previous to the angling season, ceasing on 15th September.	12. Not many; well protected. Angling in October stopped.
13. No change.	13. No.	13. No change observed.
14. No. About 9 lbs. Salmon peale, 5½ lbs.	14. No increase on previous year. Average weight of salmon, from 10 to 11 lbs.; peale or grilse, from 5½ to 5¾ lbs.	14. No.
15. None.	15. None.	15. None.
16. A little increased, chiefly in open season of 1875.	16. Much the same.	16. Diminished.
17. None.	17. There is only one, upon the Mohima River.	17. Fish passes have been built at Ballisodare and Sligo.
18. None required.	18. Upon the mill weir on the Clydagh River.	18. None required.
19. None since last report; all were perfect then.	19. To all where required.	19. All where required.
20. None.	20. None.	20. None; all the racks put in good order.
21. Same as previous year.	21. Lessees of Moy Fishery, draft nets, tidal portion of Moy; Wingfield Stratford, do., estuary of Moy; William Little, bag nets, Enniscrone and Kilcummin.	21. William Petrie, two draft nets, Sligo River; do., bag net, Streeda.
22. Nineteen prosecutions.	22. Nearly all the prosecutions in this district are done by Mr. Little, manager of the Moy Fishery.	22. Cannot.
23. —	23. There were some prosecutions at the suit of the Constabulary.	23. Cannot.
24. None.	24. Not for the last eight or ten years.	24. None.
25. About seventy-eight.	25. One hundred and five.	25. Twenty.
26. About same as last year; cannot give number; chiefly employed for open season.	26. Over 250.	26. About sixty.
27. Conservators' bailiffs employed for the winter season; bailiffs by upper proprietors in open season.	27. November, December, and January, for the protection of salmon; April and May for fry; and some all the year.	27. Mostly during the close season, and a few in the open season.
28. None, beyond that contributed in open season. They give the Board no funds for protection beyond that which they pay for licence duty.	28. Not aware of any.	28. Twenty-six bailiffs employed by William Petrie for close season, in Bonnet River; twenty-five by Colonel Cooper, Ballisodare Fishery; four by Owen Wynne, Glencar Lake; and four by H. W. Gore Booth, Glencar Lake and Drumcliff River.
29. The amount at the disposal of the Conservators does not meet more than one-third the bailiffs' salaries; the difference is made up by the tidal proprietors or lessees.	29. From £2 to £10.	29. From £15 to £2 a year.
30. None.	30. Drift nets having increased so much in Killala Bay, from one in 1863 to thirty-two in 1875, and believing the number will be considerably increased during the ensuing season, we would suggest the propriety of the Fishery Inspectors holding an inquiry with reference to them as soon as they can conveniently do so, as we are of opinion that the length of each net should not exceed 200 yards, and that they should be prohibited within a line drawn from Enniscrone to Ross station, and from a line drawn from the northerly point of Patrick's Rock to Kilcummin station.	30. None.

APPENDIX, No. 10.—ABSTRACT

Substance of Queries issued to Boards of Conservators.	Replies received from Boards of Conservators.	
	13. BALLYSHANNON.	14. LETTERKENNY.
1. What is the general state of the Salmon Fisheries in this district?	1. Great decrease.	1. Very satisfactory.
2. Has the take of salmon throughout the district been more or less productive in 1875 than in 1874, and to what is attributed the increase or diminution?	2. Less productive. Cause not known. The bays are infested to a far greater extent than ever known before with ravenous dog fish.	2. More productive. Chiefly attributable to the fin season.
3. What was the average price obtained for salmon last year by the captors? (This has no reference to price obtained by the dealers in salmon.) What was the highest price given for salmon last season? What was the lowest price?	3. 7½*d.* per lb. 1*s.* 3*d.* per lb. 6*d.* per lb.	3. 8*d.* per lb. 1*s.* per lb. 6*d.* per lb.
4. What proportion of the entire capture in your district is exported, and what proportion purchased for home consumption?	4. Nearly all exported.	4. Almost all exported.
5. What is the amount of protection rendered during the present close season of 1875, as compared with preceding season of 1874?	5. No difference.	5. On some of the rivers extra bailiffs were appointe in 1875.
6. Has the quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers in your district been greater or less as compared with preceding year, 1874?	6. Less.	6. More plentiful.
7. About what period do the salmon commence to spawn in the several rivers in your district? What are the greatest spawning months? and when is spawning over? and generally where are the most important spawning grounds situated?	7. November. The greatest spawning months are November and December. Spawning over beginning of January. The Erne, Maguire's-bridge, Arney, Swanlinbar, Killeshandra, Ballyconnell, Bundrowes, Dangal, Inver and Fintra rivers, Bunduff, Tawney, Cloontagh, and Glenade.	7. In October. Spawning greater in November an December. Spawning is over end of January Lennan and Ballydoon.
8. Are there any streams which are suitable for spawning now unproductive in consequence of obstructions? If so, state where and nature of obstruction.	8. Know of none.	8. Not aware of any.
9. At what period of the year, in each river in your district, are the first clean fish taken? When do the grilse begin to run? When are the spent fish well out of the river? and when does the great bulk of the fry go to sea? Has the quantity of fry descending this year been observably greater or less than usual?	9. In the Bundrowes in February and January. In Erne and Bunduff, April. Grilse begin to run in May. Spent fish are well out in March. Bulk of fry descend about April. Much the same—rather greater.	9. In Lennan River by 1st February. In other parts April and May. Grilse begin to run in May. Spen fish are well out in April and May. Bulk of fr descend in May; but may go down earlier if flood on rivers. Greater in most places.
10. During the descent of the fry to the sea, is angling for trout prohibited by any of the proprietors of fisheries, or is it carried on during these months, and does much destruction of fry take place?	10. In the Erne only.	10. In most places there is no prohibition, but no much destruction of fry, as there are few anglers a this season.
11. At what period of the year do the fish begin to be discoloured, or to get heavy in spawn; and what is the general opinion as to the proper season for angling in your district?	11. End of August. In September. The present angling season is, we think, very fair.	11. August and September. The present season, a allowed by the Inspectors, seems to give satisfaction
12. Have you reason to suppose that many spent fish have been destroyed hitherto in the months of February or March, and full fish in the month of October by anglers?	12. Yes.	12. No change observed.
13. Are you aware of any change having taken place in regard to the period of the season when the salmon in your district is in best order, whether earlier or later than heretofore? If so, state particulars.	13. None.	13. No; but believe in the early part of the seaso salmon is in best order.
14. Is there any increase in the average size of the spring salmon or the peale. Give average weight of salmon and peale in the season 1875, as far as practicable?	14. No. Salmon, 12½ lbs.; peale, 6½ lbs.	14. Average weight, 10½ lbs. to 5½ lbs.
15. Are there any pollutions or poisonous matter entering the rivers in your district? If so, state the particular cases.	15. Flax water.	15. None, with the exception of flax water in a few instances at close of season.
16. Have offences against the Fishery Laws increased or diminished?	16. Increased.	16. Diminished.
17. Give a list of the fish passes built in your district.	17. One on Maguire's-bridge, and several on the River of the Upper Erne in connexion with the Drainage and Navigation works executed some years ago by the Board of Works.	17. At Lennan, Gweedore, and Gweebarra.
18. Where would fish passes be practicable and advantageous?	18. On the Oiley at Bruckless. Mr. Barton's weir on the Bunduff.	18. None mentioned as being advantageous, with the exception of one on the Ballina River to let the salmon more freely into Alton Lake, on Mr. Olphert's property.
19. Have gratings been attached to mill-leads, or other artificial channels, in conformity with the 32 Vic., cap. 9, since last Report? and, if so, specify the particular cases, and whether at head or tail races, or both.	19. None.	19. None since last report.
20. What instances and nature of precautions have been adopted at mills other than that prescribed by the late Act, to prevent the destruction of fish, since last Report?	20. None.	20. Wire netting at Ramelton.
21. Where and by whom have fixed engines been used in 1875?	21. Proprietors of the Erne River, one stake net and four fixed draft nets, tideway of the River Erne; Wm. Sinclair, one fixed draft net and one pole net, Inver; H. G. Murray Stewart, two fixed draft nets, Killybegs; Marquess of Conyngham, one fixed draft net, Bian Rock; Ebenezer Bustard, one fixed draft net, Drimanoe; Right Hon. W. F. Cowper Temple, one fixed draft net, Mullaghmore.	21. A box net at Mr. Richardson's, Buncrana. A box net at Mr. Kelly's fishery, Ramelton. A box net at Lord Cloncurry's, Gweebarra River, Ducharry Bridge.
22. Can you give a list of the prosecutions instituted by the Conservators during the year 1875?	22. One at Ballinagh; flax water; convicted; paid 5*s.* One at Donegal; poaching; convicted; 10*s.* One at Kinlough; fishing for eels without licence; convicted; £6.	22. A man named O'Donnell, killing a salmon with a gaff; convicted; penalty £4; not paid; defendant committed to gaol for two months.
23. Can you give a list of prosecutions for fishery offences instituted by others, stating whether by Constabulary or other persons, during 1875?	23. One by Doctor Sheil at Donegal for poaching: party convicted and fined £12. One by the Constabulary at Kiltyclogher for flax steeping; convicted and fined 15*s.*	23. Prosecutions for offences against Fishery Laws in 1875 were instituted by the Constabulary at Milford, Buncrana, Carndonagh, and Ramelton; small fines in each case imposed.
24. Are there any new modes of fishing for salmon adopted in your district? If so what are they, and where used?	24. None.	24. No.
25. What is the number of water-bailiffs employed by Conservators?	25. About 200.	25. About one hundred.
26. What is the number employed in district by private individuals?	26. When employed by private individuals their warrants are signed by the Conservators.	26. Not aware of any.
27. For what length of time employed?	27. Yearly.	27. A few head bailiffs by the year, others only during the fishing season, and some extra for close season.
28. Are there any proprietors who contribute towards protection? if so, where, and how much?	28. Yes; several through the Board of Conservators.	28. None.
29. What is the rate of wages paid by the Conservators?	29. From £2 to £5.	29. Head keepers from £30 to £25 per year, others only £2 10*s.* and £3 per year.
30. Are there any suggestions or general observations with which the Conservators may be disposed to favour the Inspectors, with reference to the Salmon Fisheries *in your district*—whether as to the rate of licence duty upon fishing engines or other matters?	30. In the event of any Bill relating to the Salmon Fisheries being introduced into Parliament, this Board would urge the Inspectors to have a clause introduced whereby the having in possession a net, gaff, strokehaul, or other instrument *on banks of rivers* during close season be rendered illegal, and be liable to seizure, &c.	30. The Conservators would be glad if the Constabulary were directed to take more interest in carrying out the Fishery Laws, and not allowing persons to fish without payment of licence duty, and to prevent poachers taking unclean fish in early part of close season.

STATEMENTS from Boards of Conservators—*continued.*

Replies received from Boards of Conservators.

15¹. LONDONDERRY.	15². COLERAINE.	16. BALLYCASTLE.
1. Satisfactory.	1. Very satisfactory.	1. Satisfactory in most respects.
2. Less productive.	2. In the Bann much the same, but a great falling off in the sea-coast fishery.	2. Less, except in such fisheries as have a large quantity of fresh water flowing. Attributable to dryness of season.
3. 8½*d.* per lb. 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 7*d.* per lb.	3. About 1*s.* 2*d.* per lb. 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 10*d.* per lb.	3. 11*d.* per lb. 2*s.* per lb. 9*d.* per lb.
4. Nearly all exported.	4. Fully two-thirds, and nearly one-third purchased for home consumption.	4. Eleven-twelfths exported; one-twelfth for home consumption.
5. About the same.	5. Much the same.	5. Same as regards number of keepers—but at an increase of 2*s.* per week for temporary men.
6. Not so great.	6. Rather less.	6. Less.
7. November. December and January. February. The Derg, Stroule, Mourne, Glenelly, Finn, Roe, and Faughan Rivers.	7. The latter end of November. The greatest spawning month is December. Spawning is over about the middle of January. The Maine, Braid, Claudy, Agovey, Ballinderry, and Mayola Rivers.	7. 12th November. The greatest spawning months are November and December. Spawning is over 20th January. River Bush.
8. The upper part of the Faughan River, in consequence of a mill weir at Ballyarton.	8. Not aware of any.	8. None.
9. The Foyle is the only river in the district of consequence; first clean fish captured in April. In May. End of March. In April. About the same.	9. About the middle of April. Grilse begin to run in May. Spent fish are well out in the beginning of April. In the months of April, May, and June. Much the same as last year.	9. Always a clean fish in Bush. Grilse begin to run 12th May. Spent fish are well out of river by 20th March. 15th March to 1st May. Greater.
10. Not prohibited, and considerable destruction of fry takes place.	10. Not prohibited, and a considerable quantity of fry are destroyed in consequence.	10. Not totally prohibited; but great caution used in giving permission, and keepers warned to look strictly out that no fry are destroyed.
11. End of August. End of September. From 15th March to 15th September.	11. In the latter end of September. In October. From the 1st March to the 31st October.	11. This depends on the time fish are in the fresh water. They will be caught in the sea heavy in spawn from 1st August on.
12. Yes.	12. Believe that spent fish are taken occasionally in the month of February but *not* in March, and full fish in large numbers in the month of October by anglers.	12. No. There may be a few odd fish in latter end of October.
13. No.	13. No.	13. Not aware of any change.
14. None. The peale are smaller. Average size. Salmon, 11 lbs.; peale, 6½ lbs.	14. Do not think there is any increase in the size of the spring fish. The average weight about 10 lbs.	14. Yes. An attempt was made, and it is believed with success, by the owner of Bush, Sir E. W. Macnaghten, bart., to cross a Bann with a Bush fish. Since then the average weight of salmon is increased. Weight of salmon varies much—28 lbs. was the heaviest weight heard of.
15. Only flax water.	15. Yes. In the Sixmilewater, at Ballyclare paper mills, and other places between Ballyclare and Antrim on the same river. The rivers in this district have been polluted with flax water to a very serious extent, and a large number of fish destroyed.	15. Flax culture greatly on the decrease. Managers of Ballycastle gasworks were again guilty of polluting the river there this season.
16. Rather increased.	16. Offences considerably diminished.	16. Poaching much on the increase.
17. At Sion Mills.	17. None.	17. None.
18. At Ballyarton, on the Faughan River.	18. On every weir at the different mills.	18. None required.
19. No.	19. None since last report.	19. Yes. The principal breeding river of the district, the Bush. The proprietor himself provided gratings; and generally speaking the mill owners have been found friendly and desirous of preserving fish.
20. None.	20. None.	20. None necessary. See answer to last query.
21. The lessees of the Irish Society, three stake nets and eight fixed draft nets, in Lough Foyle and River Foyle; James Fleming, lessee of George Young, three bag nets, in Culdaff Bay; Sir H. H. Bruce, one bag net and one fixed draft net, in the sea off Magilligan; William Lorton, one fixed draft net, in the sea off Magilligan.	21. S. M. Alexander & Co., four fixed draft nets, Cranagh, on the River Bann; do., four boxes or cribs, The Cutts, Coleraine.	21. John Mill, two bag nets, Portmoon; R. J. Gregg, five bag nets, Portrush; Sir E. Macnaghten, four bag nets and one draft net, Portballantrae, &c.; Sir H. Boyd, one draft net, Ballycastle; Andrew Lindsay, Wm. Lindsay, one draft net each, Belfast Lough; John Rennie, one bag net, Ballycastle; Hugh Dixon, one bag net, Ballintoy; Nicholas Black, one draft net, Cushendall; James Kelly, one bag net, Larrybane; Robert Woodside, two draft nets, Kinbane; Lord Antrim, one bag net, Glenarm; Archibald M'Keighan, one draft net, Cushendall.
22. Patrick Bonner, fishing with an unlicensed net; convicted; £1 1*s.*; paid. Do., fishing with a net in a mill-race in close time; convicted; £5; paid. Thomas Ross, fishing with a net in a mill-race; convicted; £1. William Sharkey, assaulting water-bailiff; convicted; 2*s.* 6*d.*; not paid. Hugh Bradley, refusing to produce licence; convicted; £3; not paid. William M'Laughlin, obstructing inspector; convicted; £1; not paid. William Sharkey, do.; convicted; £1; not paid. James Bradley, do.; convicted; £1; not paid. Hugh Bradley, do.; convicted; £2; paid.	22. One hundred and thirty-six prosecutions by water bailiffs. Amount of fines payable to Conservators, £70 19*s.* 6*d.*	22. Dan Dunne *v.* James Jamieson and five others, letting flax water into river; convicted; £3. Two poachers prosecuted at Ballycastle for using gaff; fined £5 each by Magistrates. Appealed against; and at Quarter Sessions the case was quashed on the ground of informality.
23. A few cases by the Constabulary, and also some by the water-bailiffs of the lessees of the Irish Society's Fishery, on several rivers for infringement of close time and using illegal instruments, &c.	23. Yes. Thirteen prosecutions by Constabulary; amount of fines, £6 6*s.* 3*d.*	23. Not aware of any.
24. None.	24. Not aware of any.	24. Drift or trammel nets.
25. About 190.	25. Sixty.	25. Owing to insufficiency of funds a certain sum was apportioned to each river, and given to the proprietor of it, as it was expected in self-interest he would see to the preservation himself. The plan seems to have worked well in 1875.
26. About forty by the lessees of the Irish Society's Fishery in Lough Foyle.	26. Twelve.	26. See answer to last query.
27. Generally from 1st November to 1st April; in a few cases for the whole year.	27. Those employed by Board of Conservators are by the year; those by private parties for the close season only.	27. Permanent keepers the whole year; extra keepers from 12th November to 1st February.
28. His Grace the Duke of Abercorn supplements the salary of the Conservators' bailiffs at Sion Mills, and the lessees of the Irish Society's Fishery in the Foyle subscribe annually about £600 towards the funds of the district in addition to their licence duty and rate.	28. No, except what is paid to bailiffs as salary.	28. It is supposed that, owing to the arrangement mentioned in reply to No. 25, that every proprietor contributed something towards preservation.
29. From £3 to £20 per annum.	29. From £6 to £24, and three at £40 each.	29. 8*s.* per week for permanent men; 14*s.* for occasional.
30. That the attention of the Coast Guards, who are always on duty near the entrance of Lough Foyle, be directed to the frequent infringement of the weekly close time by persons fishing drift nets in the sea, not only in this, but in the Coleraine district. The fishermen repeatedly pass close to and are seen by the Coast Guards when going and returning from this illegal fishing. The Conservators employ an inspector, and a boat manned by four men, to prevent this illegal mode of fishing; but it is often the practice of the poachers to go out of this into the Coleraine district, where our inspector won't follow them.	30. Yes, a ten shilling licence on trout rods, which would be a great protection to the salmon fry in the months of March, April, and May, as a large quantity are destroyed by anglers for trout.	30. None.

Appendix, No. 10.—Abstract of Statements from Boards of Conservators—*concluded.*

Substance of Queries issued to Boards of Conservators.	Replies received from Boards of Conservators.	
	17¹. Drogheda.	17². Dundalk.
1. What is the general state of the Salmon Fisheries in this district?	1. Satisfactory.	1. Net fishing pretty fair, but angling indifferent.
2. Has the take of salmon throughout the district been more or less productive in 1875 than in 1874, and to what is attributed the increase or diminution?	2. The capture in the tidal waters, and that part of the fresh waters adjoining, was very large up to the end of May; afterwards the take fell off and continued small till close of season. Angling was not so good as in former years, caused by excessive and continuous drought, which prevented the fish running up. The diminution in capture in the lower waters arose from the fact that "peale" did not come in so early as usual.	2. Less productive, owing to the increased number of nets used and the constant net fishing in 1874; also to the want of floods in the inland rivers in spring of 1875.
3. What was the average price obtained for salmon last year by the captors? (This has no reference to price obtained by the dealers in salmon.) What was the highest price given for salmon last season? What was the lowest price?	3. 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. 1*s.* per lb.	3. 1*s.* 3*d.* per lb. 2*s.* per lb. 7*d.* per lb.
4. What proportion of the entire capture in your district is exported, and what proportion purchased for home consumption?	4. Nine-tenths at least; very little purchased for home consumption.	4. About nine-tenths sent to Dublin and Belfast, also to England, and one-tenth purchased for home consumption.
5. What is the amount of protection rendered during the present close season of 1875, as compared with preceding season of 1874?	5. About the same as last year; but increased vigilance is being shown both by the employés of the Board and the Constabulary and Coast-guard.	5. The same.
6. Has the quantity of breeding fish observed in the rivers in your district been greater or less as compared with preceding year, 1874?	6. The increase of "breeding" fish continues, and the stock for the present season is very large.	6. Greater.
7. About what period do the salmon commence to spawn in the several rivers in your district? What are the greatest spawning months? and when is spawning over? and generally where are the most important spawning grounds situated?	7. Early in September as regards the great body of fish; but there have been instances of individuals having been found on the spawning beds during the last week in August. Spawning generally over by the middle of December; but a few late fish may be found up to January. The upper waters of almost all the rivers in the district.	7. In the Glyde and Dee in November; the greatest spawning months in these rivers are November and December. In the Fane and all rivers north of it a little later, and the most important spawning grounds on the Dee are at Drumcar, Charleville, Drumgoolstown, Richardstown, and near Ardee. On the Glyde in Castlebellingham demesne, at Mansfieldstown Drumleck, Corballis, Lesrinny, Tallanstown, Feeras Tully, and Coolderry demesne. In the Fane at Stephenstown, Grange, Castlering, Drumgonnelly Dromass, Inniskeen, Moyles, Iniskish, Magoney Drumkee, Annagad, and Colloville. In Castletown River at Castletown, Tateetra, Killen, and Knockagh In Dungooley and Forkhill Rivers at Scotchgreen Waterlodge, Falmore, and Dungooley. In the Flurry River at Ballurgan and Ravensdale Park In the Piedmont River at Piedmont, Spillikanee and Mountbagnal.
8. Are there any streams which are suitable for spawning now unproductive in consequence of obstructions? If so, state where and nature of obstruction.	8. None absolutely; but in seasons of excessive drought some of the tributaries are difficult of access. All the rivers in the district have very heavy gradients and rise and fall with great rapidity.	8. Yes. Dunleer River, commonly called White River, is obstructed by the Dunleer mill weir.
9. At what period of the year, in each river in your district, are the first clean fish taken? When do the grilse begin to run? When are the spent fish well out of the river? and when does the great bulk of the fry go to sea? Has the quantity of fry descending this year been observably greater or less than usual?	9. At the opening of the season. Grilse begin to run about the 10th of June. Spent fish are well out early in May. April and May; but much depends on the state of the rivers. Very great.	9. In the Glyde and Dee on 1st February, and in the Fane, 1st April. In all rivers north of these in July. In the Dee and Glyde in the end of June, and in the other rivers in the end of July. In March and April. In April and May. Less.
10. During the descent of the fry to the sea, is angling for trout prohibited by any of the proprietors of fisheries; or is it carried on during these months, and does much destruction of fry take place?	10. Not prohibited. Every exertion is made by the water-bailiffs and Constabulary to prevent the capture of fry; but nevertheless numbers of them are destroyed.	10. Not prohibited. Angling is carried on during these months, but not much destruction of fry takes place, and that only by boys.
11. At what period of the year do the fish begin to be discoloured, or to get heavy in spawn; and what is the general opinion as to the proper season for angling in your district?	11. In the latter end of July. The great majority are so in August, except as regards peale, which continue "clean" till the middle of September.	11. In September; in October. The proper season for angling in the Glyde and Dee from 1st February till 1st October. In all rivers north of these from 1st April until 1st November.
12. Have you reason to suppose that many spent fish have been destroyed hitherto in the months of February or March, and full fish in the month of October by anglers?	12. Considerable numbers are annually destroyed in the upper waters by anglers, especially with cross-lines. Not many "full" fish taken.	12. Not during the last three years.
13. Are you aware of any change having taken place in regard to the period of the season when the salmon in your district is in best order, whether earlier or later than heretofore? If so, state particulars.	13. The seasons have been gradually getting earlier for some years past; and fish are in best condition in the earlier part.	13. No.
14. Is there any increase in the average size of the spring salmon or the peale? Give average weight of salmon and peale in the season 1875, as far as practicable?	14. Spring fish have increased very much in size of late years. This, however, was not maintained during last season—large fish being the exception. Average weight of salmon 14 lbs.; peale 4 to 7 lbs.	14. Both smaller in 1875 than in 1874. Average weight of salmon, 14 lbs., and peale, 5 lbs.
15. Are there any pollutions or poisonous matter entering the rivers in your district? If so, state the particular cases.	15. Chiefly flax water. Mostly confined to the borders of Meath and Cavan.	15. The only pollution of any consequence is spent wash running into the Castletown River from the Dundalk distillery, which it appears cannot be avoided.
16. Have offences against the Fishery Laws increased or diminished?	16. Diminished to a remarkable extent.	16. Diminished.
17. Give a list of the fish passes built in your district.	17. None during the present season; one or two repaired or improved.	17. On the Dee at Willistown, Whitemills, Ardee, and Julianstown. On the Glyde at Lynns, Castlebellingham, and Bragganstown.
18. Where would fish passes be practicable and advantageous?	18. On tributaries—Skeene, Trimleston, Murmod, and Devlin.	18. At Channonrock mill weir, and at Philipstown.
19. Have gratings been attached to mill-leads, or other artificial channels, in conformity with the 32 Vic., cap. 9, since last Report? and, if so, specify the particular cases, and whether at head or tail races, or both.	19. None.	19. No.
20. What instances and nature of precautions have been adopted at mills other than that prescribed by the late Act, to prevent the destruction of fish, since last Report?	20. None.	20. None.
21. Where and by whom have fixed engines been used in 1875?	21. H. B. Coddington, stone weir, Old Bridge; C. W. Osborne, stone weir, Rosnaree.	21. John F. Jones, one bag net, in the sea at Dunaney. Arthur Newcomen, do., in the sea at Clogher Head. James M'Keown, one head weir, in the sea, at Seabank, Castlebellingham.
22. Can you give a list of the prosecutions instituted by the Conservators during the year 1875?	22. Richard Lynch and others, fixed nets in River Boyne; convicted; £6; paid. C. W. Osborne, crib open during weekly close season; do.; £5; do. J. M'Cullagh, fishing with net in mill-dam; do.; 10*s.*; do. Patrick Donelly, sale of spent fish; do.; 15*s.*; do. John Kirk, do.; do.; £2; do. Luke Brodigan and others, fishing with nets in fresh water; fishing with nets in work appurtenant to a mill; fishing at navigation weir; dismissed without prejudice. Andrew Tiernan and others, fishing at navigation weir; fishing with nets in fresh water; dismissed without prejudice.	22. Ambrose Holdcroft, using a gaff; dismissed. Henry Holdcroft, aiding and abetting Ambrose; do. James Brown, using a gaff; convicted; £4; fine paid. Thomas Garland, using a spear in tideway; acquitted. James Neary, aiding and abetting same; do. Anne Donaldson, flax water; do. Patrick M'Kenna, do.; do. Michael Lurgy, do.; convicted; £1 1*s.*; fine paid. John Conlon, using a gaff; do.; £6; sent to gaol for two months. Same, assaulting water bailiff; do.; seven days' imprisonment.
23. Can you give a list of prosecutions for fishery offences instituted by others, stating whether by Constabulary or other persons, during 1875?	23. One prosecution by the Constabulary, against John Wallace, of Irun, for exposing spent fish for sale. A conviction was had, and a fine of 10*s.* imposed.	23. Not aware of any.
24. Are there any new modes of fishing for salmon adopted in your district? If so, what are they, and where used?	24. None.	24. No.
25. What is the number of water-bailiffs employed by Conservators?	25. Fourteen.	25. Seven including inspector.
26. What is the number employed in district by private individuals?	26. One.	26. None.
27. For what length of time employed?	27. Permanently.	27. Five permanent and an inspector, one eleven months, one ten do., one nine do., one six do., and one five do.
28. Are there any proprietors who contribute towards protection? if so, where and how much?	28. See reply to query 26.	28. No.
29. What is the rate of wages paid by the Conservators?	29. £1, 30*s.*, and £2 per month.	29. Inspector £2 10*s.*, and water bailiffs £1 5*s.* per month.
30. Are there any suggestions or general observations with which the Conservators may be disposed to favour the Inspectors, with reference to the Salmon Fisheries *in your district*—whether as to the rate of licence duty upon fishing engines or other matters?	30. —	30. The Conservators suggest and strongly recommend that the necessary steps be taken by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, with the least possible delay, to have an Act passed authorizing and empowering the Royal Irish Constabulary to enforce the provisions of sec. 80 of the 5 & 6 Vic., cap. 106, so as to prevent the pollution of rivers by flax water, &c.

Appendix, No. 11.

List of Stone Weirs in Ireland for Salmon Fishing, with their Breadth, and the size of the Queen's Gap or share maintained therein respectively.

Name of Fishery District.	Name of River.	Name of Weir.	Breadth of Stream.	Size of Queen's Gap previous to passing of 26 & 27 Vic., c. 114.	Observations.
			Ft. in.	Ft. in.	
Ballinakill,	Bundorragha,	Bundorragha,	about 60 0	10 0	Not used.
	Ass or Errive,	Ashleagh,	„ 60 0	No gap,	Ditto.
Banger,	Owenmore,	Goulamore,	„ 429 0	No gap,	Ditto.
	Munhim,	Munhim,	„ 34 0	No gap,	Ditto.
	Newport,	Newport,	158 4		Gap 15 feet 10 inches Not used.
Ballina,	Moy,	Ballina,	341 8	No gap,	Do. 34 feet 2 inches.
	Ditto,	Foxford,	295 10	11 0	Do. 29 feet 7 inches, weir not used.
Sligo,	Sligo,		432 0	No gap,	Not used. A fishing mill-dam.
Ballyshannon,	Bundrowes,	Bundrowes,	68 4	No gap,	Gap 6 feet 10 inches.
	Erne,	Erne,	—	—	A fishing mill-dam.
	Inver,		about 105 0	No gap,	Not used.
	Ditto,	Eske,	„ 82 0	No gap,	Ditto.
Coleraine,	Bann,	The Cutts of Coleraine,	455 0	18 0	A fishing mill-dam. Pass, 30 feet in breadth, opened.
Ballycastle,	Bush,		230 0	No gap,	Gap 12 feet 9 inches. Not used.
Drogheda,	Boyne,	Oldbridge,	240 0	22 6	Do. 24 feet.
	Ditto,	Rosnaree,	300 0	13 and 35	Do. 18 feet.
	Ditto,	Newgrange,	224 0	No gap,	Do. 18 feet.
Letterkenny,	Leenane,	Rathmelton,	159 0	No gap,	Two Gaps of 6 feet each.
	Lackagh,	Lackagh,	211 0	No gap,	Gap 20 feet. Not used.
	Owenea,	Owenea,	145 0	No gap,	Gap 14½ feet. Not used.
Londonderry,	Finn,	Killygordon,	about 198 0	No gap,	Do. 20 feet. Not used.
	Buncrana,	Buncrana,	180 0	No gap,	Do. 18 feet.
Waterford,	Nore,	Innistiogue,	173 0	60 0	Do. 60 feet.
	Ditto,	Rockview,	98 0	78 0	Do. 78 feet.
	Ditto,	Jerpoint,	99 0	66 0	Do. 66 feet.
	Ditto,	Dysart,	93 0	47 0	Do. 47 feet.
	Suir,	Coolnamuck,	176 0	47 0	Do. 47 feet.
	Tay,	Woodhouse,	55 0	No gap,	Do. 6 feet.
Lismore,	Blackwater,	Lismore Weir,	315 0	No gap,	Do. 31 feet 6 inches.
Cork,	Lee,	The North Lee Fishery Weir or "Hayes' Weir."	408 0	No gap,	A fishing mill-dam. Not used.
	Ditto,	The weir above Wellington Bridge.	780 0	No gap,	Ditto. Not used.
	Ditto,	"The Upper Gill Abbey Weir."	378 0	No gap,	Ditto. Not used.
	Ditto,	"The Sugar House Weir."	114 0	No gap,	Gap 11 feet 5 inches.
Killarney,	Carra,	Carra,	160 0	No gap,	Gap 16 feet.
	Waterville or Curraun.	Waterville,	under 40 0	No gap,	Extension of weekly close season from noon on Friday to noon on Monday ordered instead of gap, stream being under 40 feet—26 & 27 Vic., c. 114, s. 11.
Limerick,	Shannon,	Lax Weir,	840 0	21 0	Gap 50 feet.
Galway,	Galway,	Galway Salmon Weirs,	205 10	16 0	Do. 20 feet 7 inches.
	Owenmore or Great River.	Ballinahinch Trout and Salmon Weirs.	228 0	No gap,	Do. 22 feet. Not used.
	Spiddal,	Spiddal Salmon Weir,	varies greatly; 283 0 to 12 0	No gap,	Do. 12 feet. Not used.
	Furbough,	The Furbough Salmon Weir.	14 0	No gap,	Do. 3 feet. Not used.

APPENDIX, No. 12.

APPENDIX,

TABLE showing the CLOSE SEASONS for SALMON and

No. and Name of District.	Boundary of District.	Tidal.
1. Dublin,	Skerries to Wicklow.	From Howth to Dalkey Island, between 16th August and 31st January, both the said days inclusive. For remainder of District, between 16th September and 3rd March, both the said days inclusive.
2. Wexford,	Wicklow to Kiln Bay, East of Bannow Bay.	Between 16th September and 19th April, both days inclusive.
3. Waterford,	Kiln Bay to Helvick Head.	„ 16th August and 31st January, both days inclusive.
4. Lismore,	Helvick Head to Ballycotton.	„ 1st September and 15th February, both days inclusive.
5. Cork,	Ballycotton Head to Galley Head.	„ 16th August and the 14th of February, both days inclusive, save in Bandon and Argideen Rivers; 16th August and last day of February for Bandon, and 1st September and last day of February for Argideen.
6[1]. Skibbereen,	Galley Head to Mizen Head.	„ 1st October and 30th April, both days inclusive.
6[2]. Bantry,	Mizen Head to Crow Head.	„ Do. do. do.
6[3]. Kenmare,	Crow Head to Lamb Head.	„ 16th September and 31st March, both days inclusive.
7. Killarney,	Lamb Head to Dunmore Head, including Blaskets.	„ 31st July and 16th January, save Rivers Maine, Ferta, or Valencia, Inny, and Waterville, and their Tributaries. Maine, Ferta or Valencia, Inny, and Tributaries, 15th September to 1st May. Waterville and its Tributaries, 16th July and 1st January.
8. Limerick,	Dunmore to Hags Head.	Between 1st August and 11th February, both days inclusive, save River Cashen and Tributaries, and save between Kerry Head and Dunmore Head, and between Loop Head and Hags Head, and all Rivers running into the sea between those points. For River Cashen down to its Mouth and Tributaries, between 1st September and 31st May, both days inclusive. Between Dunmore Head and Kerry Head, and all Rivers flowing into sea between those points, between 16th September and 31st March, both days inclusive. Between Loop Head and Hags Head, and all Rivers running into the sea between those points, between 16th September and 30th April, both days inclusive.
9. Galway,	Hags Head to Slyne Head.	Between 16th August and 31st January, both days inclusive.
10[1]. Ballinakill,	Slyne Head to Pigeon Point.	Save in Louisburgh and Carrownisky Rivers, between the 1st of September and the 15th of February, both days inclusive. For Louisburgh and Carrownisky Rivers and Estuaries, between 16th of September and 30th June, both days inclusive.
10[2]. Bangor,	Pigeon Point to Benwee Head.	Between 1st September and 15th February, both days inclusive, save in Newport and Glenamoy, Burrishoole and Owengarve Rivers and Estuaries. For Newport River and Estuary, 1st September and 19th March; Glenamoy River and Estuary, 16th September and 30th April; Burrishoole and Owengarve River and Estuaries, 1st September and 15th February, all said days inclusive.
11. Ballina,	Benwee to Coonamore.	Between 13th August and 15th March, save Palmerston and Easkey Rivers, which is between 1st September and 31st May, all said days inclusive.
12. Sligo,	Coonamore to Mullaghmore.	„ 20th August and 3rd February, save tidal parts of Sligo River, which is 16th July and 31st December, all said days inclusive.
13. Ballyshannon,	Mullaghmore to Rossan.	„ 20th August and last day of February, both days inclusive; 18th September and 31st March for River Eske and tributaries.
14. Letterkenny,	Rossan to Malin Head.	„ 20th August and 3rd Feb., and one mile above Tideway, save Lennan, Crana or Buncrana, and Gweebarra Rivers. For Lennan River, 20th August and 3rd February. „ Crana or Buncrana River, 15th September and 14th April; for Gweebarra, 1st October and 31st March, all said days inclusive.
15[1]. Londonderry,	Malin to Downhill Boundary.	Between 31st August and 15th April.
15[2]. Coleraine,	Downhill Boundary to Portrush.	„ 19th August and 4th February.
16. Ballycastle,	Portrush to Donaghadee.	„ Do. do. do.
17[1]. Drogheda,	Skerries to Clogher Head.	„ 20th August and 11th February, both days inclusive.
17[2]. Dundalk,	Clogher Head to Donaghadee.	„ 1st September and 31st March, save in Annagassan, Glyde, Dee, and Fane Rivers and Tributaries, both days inclusive. In Glyde, Dee, and Annagassan Rivers, between 20th August and 11th February; in Fane River between 20th August and 31st March, all said days inclusive.

NOTE.—The 21st section of the 26th & 27th Vic., c. 114, requires there shall not be fewer than 168 days Close Season in each Fishery.
WEEKLY CLOSE SEASON.—By the 20th section of the 26th & 27th Vic., c. 114, no Salmon or Trout shall be fished for or taken in any way, except by Sing Rod and Line, between six of the clock on Saturday morning and six of the clock on the succeeding Monday morning.

No. 12.

TROUT in the different Districts in Ireland.

Fresh Water.	Angling with Cross Lines.	Angling with Single Rod and Line.	Date of last change.	No. and Name of District.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	1st Nov. and last day of Jan., both days inclusive.	15th Oct. 1874.	1. Dublin.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	1st Oct. and 14th March, both days inclusive.	26th Dec. 1873.	2. Wexford.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	1st Oct. and 31st Jan., both days inclusive.	12th Nov. 1874.	3. Waterford.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	13th Oct. and 14th Feb., both days inclusive.	16th Dec. 1875.	4. Lismore.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	13th Oct. and 14th of Feb., both days inclusive.	20th Dec. 1875.	5. Cork.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Between 1st Nov. and 16th March, both days inclusive.	29th Jan. 1873.	6[1]. Skibbereen.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.		28th Jan. 1873.	6[2]. Bantry.
Same as Tidal.	16th October and 31st March, both days inclusive.	1st Nov. and 1st day of Feb., both days inclusive.	7th Feb. 1856.	6[3]. Kenmare.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	30th Sept. and 1st Feb., save in Maine, Laune, Carra, and Tributaries.	26th April 1870.	7. Killarney.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Maine and Tributaries, 1st Oct. and 10th April.	18th Dec. 1875.	
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Laune, Carra, and Tributaries, 30th Sept. and 16th Jan.	3rd Jan. 1876.	
Same as Tidal.*	Same as Netting.	Between 1st Oct. and 31st Jan., both inclusive, save Cashen and Maigue Rivers and Tributaries, and save in all rivers running into the sea, between Loop Head and Hags Head, and between Dunmore Head and Kerry Head. For Cashen and Tributaries, 1st Oct. and 15th March; for Maigue and Tributaries, 1st Oct. and 19th Feb.; between Loop Head and Hags Head, 16th Sept. and 30th April; and between Dunmore Head and Kerry Head, 16th Sept. and 31st March, all said days inclusive.	13th Oct. 1874.	8. Limerick.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Between 16th Oct. and 31st Jan., save in Cashla and Doohulla Rivers and their Tributaries, between 1st Nov. and 31st Jan., all said days inclusive.	26th Dec. 1871.	9. Galway.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	1st Nov. and 31st Jan., save in Louisburgh and Carrownisky Rivers—between 1st Nov. and 30th June, all said days inclusive.	1st June, 1872.	10[1]. Ballinakill.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Burrishoole River, between 1st Nov. and 31st Jan.; Newport River, 1st Oct. and 30th April; and Owengarve and Glenamoy, 1st Nov. and 30th April; Owenduff or Ballycroy, and Owenmore and Munhim Rivers, 1st Oct. and 31st January.	7th Oct. 1875.	10[2]. Bangor.
Between 1st August and 31st January, save Palmerston and Easkey Rivers, which is between 1st September and 31st May, all said days inclusive.	Same as Netting in fresh water.	Between 16th Sept. and 31st Jan., Palmerston and Easky Rivers, 1st Oct. and 31st May, all said days inclusive.	19th Dec., 1870.	11. Ballina.
Between 20th August and 3rd February, both said days inclusive.	Same as Netting in fresh water.	1st Oct. and 31st Jan., save tidal parts of Sligo River between 1st Oct. and 31st Dec., and in Drumcliffe River and Glencar Lake between 20th Oct. and 31st Jan., all said days inclusive.	24th April, 1871.	12. Sligo.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	Between 10th Oct. and last day of Feb., save Bunduff, Bundrowes, and Erne Rivers; Bunduff River, 1st Oct. and last day of Jan.; Bundrowes, 1st Oct. and 31st Dec., and Erne River, 1st Oct. and last day Feb., all said days inclusive; River Eske, 10th of Oct. and last day of Feb.	24th Nov. 1871. 26th June, 1875.	13. Ballyshannon.
Between 20th August and last day of February. Leannan River, same as Tidal, Crana or Buncrana River, same as Tidal. Gweebarra River, same as Tidal.	Between 19th Aug. and 29th Sept. Leannan, same as Netting. Crana or Buncrana, same as Netting. Gweebarra River, same as Netting.	1st Nov. and 1st Feb., save in Leannan, 1st Nov. and 1st Feb. Crana or Buncrana, 1st Nov. and last day of Feb. Gweebarra River, 1st Nov. and 1st Feb., all said days inclusive.	2nd Sept. 1857. 28th Feb. 1874. 25th Nov. 1874. 21st Mar. 1876.	14. Letterkenny.
Same as Tidal.	28th September and 15th April.	1st Nov. and 1st Feb.	27th Jan. 1862.	15[1]. Londonderry.
19th August and 1st March.†	28th Sept. and 16th March.‡	20th Oct. and 15th March, River Bann and Tributaries, 1st Nov. and last day of Feb., all said days inclusive.	15th Dec. 1856. 31st Mar. 1871. 23rd Aug. 1875. 15th Jan. 1876.	15[2]. Coleraine.
Do. Do.	28th Sept. and 16th March.	1st Nov. and 1st Feb.	15th Dec. 1856.	16. Ballycastle.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	16th Sept. and 31st Jan., both days inclusive.	26th Dec. 1871.	17[1]. Drogheda.
Same as Tidal.	Same as Netting.	12th Oct. and last day of Feb., save in Annagassan, Glyde, and Dee Rivers. In Annagassan, Glyde, and Dee Rivers, between 1st Oct. and last day of Jan., all said days inclusive.	8th July, 1872. 15th Jan. 1876.	17[2]. Dundalk.

* Close Season for Fixed Engines for the capture of Eels, between the 10th January and 1st July, save in the River Shannon, which is between the 31st January and 1st July, and in all other rivers in the Limerick District between 31st December and 1st July in year following.

† Close Season for Fixed Engines for the capture of Eels, between the 11th day of January and 31st May, both days inclusive.

‡ Pollen Fishing by Trammel Nets in Lough Neagh, between 31st October and 1st February.

APPENDIX, Nos. 13. 14.

APPENDIX,

SCHEDULE of LICENCE DUTIES payable in each District

DISTRICT.	1. Salmon Rods.	2. Cross Lines.	3. Snap Nets.	4. Draft Nets.	5. Drift Nets.	6. Trammel Nets for Pollen.	7. Pole Nets.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1. Dublin,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
2. Wexford,	1 0 0	1 0 0	0 15 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	0 15 0	1 0 0
3. Waterford,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
4. Lismore,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
5. Cork,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
6[1]. Skibbereen,	1 0 0	1 0 0	0 15 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	0 15 0	1 0 0
6[2]. Bantry,	1 0 0	1 0 0	0 15 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	0 15 0	1 0 0
6[3]. Kenmare,	1 0 0	1 0 0	0 15 0	1 10 0	1 10 0	0 15 0	1 0 0
7. Killarney,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	0 15 0	1 0 0
8. Limerick,	1 0 0	1 5 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
9. Galway,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
10[1]. Ballynakill,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
10[2]. Bangor,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
11. Ballina,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
12. Sligo,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
13. Ballyshannon,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
14. Letterkenny,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
15[1]. Londonderry,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
15[2]. Coleraine,	1 0 0	2 0 0	0 15 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 0 0	2 0 0
16. Ballycastle,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	2 0 0
17[1]. Drogheda,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	0 15 0	2 0 0
17[2]. Dundalk,	1 0 0	2 0 0	1 10 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	0 15 0	2 0 0

APPENDIX,

SCHEDULE of LICENCE DUTIES received by the BOARDS of

DISTRICT.	Number and Description of Licences sold in 1874.																1874. Amount of Licence Duty.	1874. Percentage on Poor Law Valuation.	1874. Total Amount received.	1874. Average No. employed.	Number
	1. Salmon Rods.	2. Cross Lines.	3. Snap Nets.	4. Draft Nets.	5. Drift Nets.	6. Trammel Nets, for Pollen.	7. Pole Nets.	8. Bag Nets.	9. Fly Nets.	10. Stake Nets.	11. Head Weirs.	12. Box, Crib, &c.	13. Gap, Eye, &c.	14. Sweepers.	15. Coghills.	16. Loop Nets.					1. Salmon Rods.	2. Cross Lines.	3. Snap Nets.
																	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		
1. Dublin,	102	–	–	16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	150 0 0	—	150 0 0	198	97	–	–
2. Wexford,	102	–	1	50	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	252 15 0	—	252 15 0	406	89	–	–
3. Waterford,	239	19	263	25	86	–	–	–	–	4	1	5	–	–	–	–	1,180 10 0	—	1,180 10 0	1,911	190	18	264
4. Lismore,	222	6	34	–	112	8	1	1	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	737 0 0	40 10 0	777 10 0	962	236	6	35
5. Cork,	281	3	–	60	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	507 0 0	—	507 0 0	655	317	3	–
6[1]. Skibbereen,	8	–	–	17	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	59 0 0	—	59 0 0	110	7	–	–
6[2]. Bantry,	13	–	–	13	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	52 0 0	—	52 0 0	91	12	–	–
6[3]. Kenmare,	33	–	–	7	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	–	68 10 0	4 0 0	72 10 0	109	17	–	–
7. Killarney,	104	2	–	69	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	335 0 0	—	335 0 0	525	121	4	–
8. Limerick,	222	39	30	67	127	–	18	–	–	31	1	8	131	–	–	–	2,080 15 0	—	2,080 15 0	1,901	231	39	31
9. Galway,	170	6	–	13	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	6	19	–	–	–	303 0 0	84 0 0	387 0 0	304	110	5	–
10[1]. Ballynakill,	48	–	–	17	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	101 0 0	—	101 0 0	153	53	–	–
10[2]. Bangor,	27	–	–	19	–	–	–	11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	194 0 0	—	194 0 0	185	29	–	–
11. Ballina,	96	1	–	26	26	–	–	5	–	–	–	7	16	–	–	–	390 0 0	—	390 0 0	439	71	1	–
12. Sligo,	23	–	–	17	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	4	–	–	–	98 0 0	—	98 0 0	141	20	–	–
13. Ballyshannon,	96	6	–	41	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	4	32	–	–	–	337 0 0	142 19 0	479 19 0	430	98	9	–
14. Letterkenny,	66	–	–	13	14	–	–	3	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	4	201 0 0	7 0 0	208 0 0	232	65	1	–
15[1]. Londonderry,	77	7	–	32	30	–	3	4	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	413 0 0	95 0 0	508 0 0	470	77	6	–
15[2]. Coleraine,	112	–	–	109	2	74	–	2	–	–	–	4	10	–	67	–	653 0 0	249 0 0	902 0 0	1,021	110	1	–
16. Ballycastle,	32	–	–	12	1	–	–	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	211 0 0	10 0 0	221 0 0	165	20	–	–
17[1]. Drogheda,	51	6	5	52	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	4	–	29	–	299 10 0	—	299 10 0	455	63	4	6
17[2]. Dundalk,	45	–	–	25	–	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	7	–	–		153 0 0	10 0 0	163 0 0	218	34	–	–
Total,	2169	95	333	700	398	84	25	46	–	42	3	44	223	5	96	4	8,776 0 0	642 9 0	9,418 9 0	11,081	2067	97	336

The estimate of the average number of

Salmon Rods, . . . 1 man.	Draft Nets, . . . 6 men.	Pole Nets, . . . 3 men.
Cross Lines, . . 2 men.	Drift Nets, . . . 5 do.	Bag Nets, . . 4 do.
Snap Nets, . . . 4 do.	Trammel Nets, . 2 do.	Fly Nets, . . . 4 do.

No. 13.

on Engines used for Fishing for Salmon, January, 1875.

8. Bag Nets.	9. Fly Nets.	10. Stake Nets.	11. Head Weirs.	12. Box, Crib, &c.	13. Gap, Eye, &c.	14. Sweepers.	15. Coghills.	16. Loop Nets.
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					0 10 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					0 10 0	—	—	—
					0 10 0	—	—	—
					0 10 0	3 0 0	1 10 0	—
					0 10 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
10 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	6 0 0	10 0 0	1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	1 0 0	—
					0 10 0	—	1 0 0	1 0 0
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	1 0 0	—
					1 0 0	—	—	—
					1 0 0	—	1 0 0	0 10 0
					1 0 0	—	1 0 0	—

No. 14.

CONSERVATORS for the Years 1874 and 1875.

4. Draft Nets.	5. Drift Nets.	6. Trammel Nets, for Pollen.	7. Pole Nets.	8. Bag Nets.	9. Fly Nets.	10. Stake Nets.	11. Head Weirs.	12. Box, Crib, &c.	13. Gap, Eye, &c.	14. Sweepers.	15. Coghills.	16. Loop Nets.	1. 1875. Amount of Licence Duty.	2. 1875. Per-centage on Poor Law Valuation.	3. 1875. Amount received for Fines, Sale of Forfeited Engines, Interest on Bank Account. *	4. 1875. Amount of Subscriptions received. *	5. 1875. Total Amount received.	6. 1875. Average No. employed.	Increase or Decrease between 1874 and 1875.* Increase in Amount.	Decrease in Amount.	Increase in Number employed.	Decrease in Number employed.	District.
													£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.			
16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	145 0 0	—	—	—	145 0 0	193	—	5 0 0	–	5	1
56	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	257 0 0	—	33 5 0	1 6 8	291 11 8	425	38 16 8	—	19	–	2
29	85	–	–	–	–	4	1	5	28	–	–	–	1,168 0 0	—	83 7 4	—	1,251 7 4	1,956	70 17 4	—	45	–	3
9	114	–	1	1	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	761 10 0	41 10 0	100 8 0	—	903 8 0	1,028	125 18 0	—	66	–	4
63	6	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	570 0 0	—	61 15 1	—	631 15 1	739	124 15 1	—	84	–	5
17	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	58 0 0	—	1 10 0	—	59 10 0	109	0 10 0	—	–	1	6[1]
12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	48 0 0	—	—	—	48 0 0	84	—	4 0 0	–	7	6[2]
7	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	–	52 10 0	7 16 8	18 5 10	—	78 12 6	93	6 2 6	—	–	16	6[3]
66	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	347 0 0	—	21 16 8	—	368 16 8	526	33 16 8	—	1	–	7
70	119	–	18	–	–	31	1	8	136	–	–	–	2,081 5 0	—	141 10 4	—	2,222 15 4	1,902	142 0 4	—	1	–	8
13	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	6	22	–	–	–	247 0 0	85 0 0	—	10 0 0	342 0 0	253	—	45 0 0	–	51	9
15	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	101 0 0	—	14 8 6	—	115 8 6	148	14 8 6	—	–	5	10[1]
20	–	–	–	10	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	189 0 0	—	6 18 0	—	195 18 0	189	1 18 0	—	4	–	10[2]
29	32	–	–	5	–	–	–	7	13	–	–	–	389 0 0	—	40 13 4	—	429 13 4	456	39 13 4	—	17	–	11
16	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	6	–	–	–	84 0 0	—	—	—	84 0 0	132	—	14 0 0	–	9	12
42	–	–	3	–	–	1	–	4	32	–	–	–	350 0 0	5 0 0	16 4 9	154 14 0	525 18 9	447	45 19 9	—	17	–	13
17	11	–	–	3	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	3	214 0 0	14 0 0	4 9 5	—	232 9 5	241	24 9 5	—	9	–	14
33	23	–	3	4	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	393 0 0	95 0 0	9 5 2	605 0 0	1,102 5 2	439	594 5 2	—	–	31	15[1]
119	5	103	–	2	–	–	–	4	3	–	110	–	760 0 0	238 0 0	77 5 5	—	1,075 5 5	1,183	173 5 5	—	162	–	15[2]
11	1	–	–	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	196 0 0	27 0 0	3 13 4	113 11 0	340 4 4	147	119 4 4	—	–	18	16
57	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	3	–	34	–	328 0 0	—	7 3 8	—	335 3 8	479	35 13 8	—	24	–	17[1]
27	1	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	11	–	–	–	155 0 0	9 10 0	3 6 11	2 0 0	169 16 11	232	6 16 11	—	14	–	17[2]
744	397	107	26	44	–	42	3	45	255	5	144	3	8,894 5 0	522 16 8	645 6 9	886 11 8	10,949 0 1	11,401	1,598 11 1 †	68 0	463	143	

men employed is made up as follows:—

Stake Nets, . . 4 men. | Gap, Eye, &c. . 2 men. | Coghills, . . . 1 man.
Head weirs, . . 1 man. | Sweepers, . . 6 do. | Loop or Frame Nets, . 1 do.
Box, crib, &c. (every 5) 2 men.

* It should be observed that two additional columns, Nos. 3 and 4, have been introduced for the first time, thereby affecting the apparent increase or decrease considerably.
† Actual increase in Licence duty in 1875 over 1874—£118 5*s.*

APPENDIX, No. 15.—AMOUNT of LICENCE DUTY received for the different Fishing Engines for the Year 1875, in each District.

	District.	Single Rods.	Cross Lines.	Snap Nets.	Draft Nets.	Drift Nets.	Trammel Nets, or Draft Nets for Pollen.	Pole Nets.	Bag Nets.	Fly Nets.	Stake Nets.	Head Weirs.	Box, Crib, &c.	Gap, Eye, &c.	Sweepers.	Coghills.	Loop Nets.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1	Dublin,	97 0 0	–	–	48 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2	Wexford,	89 0 0	–	–	168 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3	Waterford,	190 0 0	36 0 0	396 0 0	87 0 0	255 0 0	–	–	–	–	120 0 0	6 0 0	50 0 0	28 0 0	–	–	–
4	Lismore,	236 0 0	12 0 0	52 10 0	27 0 0	342 0 0	–	2 0 0	10 0 0	–	60 0 0	–	20 0 0	–	–	–	–
5	Cork,	317 0 0	6 0 0	–	189 0 0	18 0 0	–	–	10 0 0	–	30 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–
6[1]	Skibbereen,	7 0 0	–	–	51 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
6[2]	Bantry,	12 0 0	–	–	36 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
6[3]	Kenmare,	17 0 0	–	–	10 10 0	–	–	–	10 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	15 0 0	–	–
7	Killarney,	121 0 0	8 0 0	–	198 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	20 0 0	–	–	–	–
8	Limerick,	231 0 0	48 15 0	46 10 0	210 0 0	357 0 0	–	36 0 0	–	–	930 0 0	6 0 0	80 0 0	136 0 0	–	–	–
9	Galway,	110 0 0	10 0 0	–	39 0 0	–	6 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	60 0 0	22 0 0	–	–	–
10[1]	Ballynakill,	53 0 0	–	–	45 0 0	–	–	2 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	1 0 0	–	–	–
10[2]	Bangor,	29 0 0	–	–	60 0 0	–	–	–	100 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
11	Ballina,	71 0 0	2 0 0	–	87 0 0	96 0 0	–	–	50 0 0	–	–	–	70 0 0	13 0 0	–	–	–
12	Sligo,	20 0 0	–	–	48 0 0	–	–	–	10 0 0	–	–	–	–	6 0 0	–	–	–
13	Ballyshannon,	98 0 0	18 0 0	–	126 0 0	–	–	6 0 0	–	–	30 0 0	–	40 0 0	32 0 0	–	–	–
14	Letterkenny,	65 0 0	2 0 0	–	51 0 0	33 0 0	–	–	30 0 0	–	–	–	30 0 0	–	–	–	3 0 0
15[1]	Londonderry,	77 0 0	12 0 0	–	99 0 0	69 0 0	–	6 0 0	40 0 0	–	90 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–
15[2]	Coleraine,	110 0 0	2 0 0	–	357 0 0	15 0 0	103 0 0	–	20 0 0	–	–	–	40 0 0	3 0 0	–	110 0 0	–
16	Ballycastle,	20 0 0	–	–	33 0 0	3 0 0	–	–	140 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
17[1]	Drogheda,	63 0 0	8 0 0	9 0 0	171 0 0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	40 0 0	3 0 0	–	34 0 0	–
17[2]	Dundalk,	34 0 0	–	–	81 0 0	3 0 0	–	–	20 0 0	–	–	6 0 0	–	11 0 0	–	–	–
	Total,	2,067 0 0	164 15 0	504 0 0	2,221 10 0	1,191 0 0	109 0 0	52 0 0	440 0 0	–	1,260 0 0	18 0 0	450 0 0	255 0 0	15 0 0	144 0 0	3 0 0

APPENDIX, No. 16.

TABLE showing the Total Amount realized and the Increase and Decrease in the Amounts received in the various Fishery Districts from the sale of Licences between the years 1863 and 1875, inclusive.

Years from 1863 to 1875.		Amount received for Licence Duty.	Increase over preceding year.	Decrease under preceding year.	Years from 1863 to 1875.		Amount received for Licence Duty.	Increase over preceding year.	Decrease under preceding year.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
—	1863	5,892 7 6	—	—	1869	1870	7,233 3 4	788 15 0	—
1863	1864	6,841 5 0	948 17 6	—	1870	1871	8,364 5 0	1,131 1 8	—
1864	1865	6,537 6 8	—	303 18 4	1871	1872	8,369 5 0	5 0 0	—
1865	1866	6,828 16 8	291 10 0	—	1872	1873	8,515 5 0	146 0 0	—
1866	1867	6,947 0 0	118 3 4	—	1873	1874	8,776 0 0	260 15 0	—
1867	1868	6,667 0 0	—	280 0 0	1874	1875	8,894 5 0	118 5 0	—
1868	1869	6,444 8 4	—	222 11 8					

Increase in Licence Duty since 1863, £3,001 17*s.* 6*d.*

APPENDIX, No. 17.

LIST of RIVERS, the MOUTHS of which have been defined, one hundred and thirty-eight in number.

Section 22 of 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106, enacts "That where the breadth of the mouth or entrance into the sea of any river, the inland "portion of which is frequented by Salmon, is less than half a mile, statute measure, at low water of spring tides, it shall "not be lawful for any person whatsoever (save and except the proprietor of a several fishery within the limits thereof) to "place or erect any stake weir or fixed net within one statute mile, seaward, coastwards, or inwards, from or on either "side of the mouth or entrance of any such river into the sea."

Section 44 of 13 & 14 Vic., c. 88, enacts "That it shall not be lawful for any person, save and except the owner of a several "fishery within the limits thereof, at any time to shoot, draw, or use any net for taking Salmon at the mouth of any river, "where the breadth of such mouth between the banks thereof shall not exceed a quarter of a mile statute measure; and "that it shall not be lawful for any person, save such owner as aforesaid, within such limits as aforesaid, to shoot, draw, "or use any net for taking Salmon within half a mile seaward, or half a mile inwards, or along the coast from the mouth "of any river."

Section 3 of 26 & 27 Vic., c. 114, enacts "That no bag net shall be placed or allowed to continue in any river, or the estuary "of any river, as such river or estuary has been defined by the Commissioners of Fisheries, or shall be defined by the "Commissioners under this Act, or within a distance of less than three statute miles from the mouth of any river, as "defined."

District.	Name of River.
Dublin,	Liffey.
	Dodder.
	Bray.
	Vartry.
Wexford,	Slaney.
	Owenavarragh or Courtown.
	Inch.
	Urrin.
	Boro.
Waterford,	Suir, Nore, and Barrow.
	Bannow.
	Tay.
Lismore,	Blackwater.
	Womanagh.
Cork,	Tramore or Douglas.
	Lee.
	Owenacurra or Middleton.
	Owenboy or Carrigaline.
	Argideen.
	Bandon.
Skibbereen,	Roury.
	Ilen.
Bantry,	Leamawaddra.
	Glengariffe.
	Coomhola or Snave.
	Ouvane or Ballylickey.
	Mealagh or Dunnemark.
	Adrigole.
Kenmare,	Roughty.
	Sheen.
	Finnehy.
	Blackwater (Kerry).
	Cloonee.
	Owenshagh.
	Crowanshagh.
	Sneem.
Killarney,	Currane.
	Inny.
	Carragh.
	Laune.
	Maine.
	Ferta or Valencia.
	Rosbehy.
Limerick,	Shannon.
	Cashen.
	Deel or Askeaton.
	Fergus.
	Maigue.
	Bunratty.
	Doonbeg.
	Feonagh.
	Glennahoo.
	Scorid.
	Owenmore.
	Galey or Geale.
	Brick.
Galway,	Corrib.
	Furbogh.
	Spiddle.
	Screeb.
	Ballinahinch.
	Cashla.
	Invermore.
	Owengowla.
	Crumlin.
Ballinakill,	Carrownisky.
	Bundorragha.
	Erriff.
Ballinakill,	Traheen.
	Owennabaunogue.
	Culfin.
	Dawros.
	Derrychorraun.
	Ballinaboy.
Bangor,	Glenamoy.
	Owenmore.
	Owenduff.
	Owengarve.
	Burrishoole.
	Newport.
	Owenwee or Belclare.
	Bunowen or Louisburgh.
Ballina,	Easky.
	Moy.
	Cloonaghmore or Palmerstown.
	Ballingten or Ballycastle.
Sligo,	Drumcliff
	Sligo.
	Ballisodare.
	Dunmoran.
Ballyshannon,	Glen or Teelin.
	Ballyhadoo or Kilcar.
	Eany-water or Inver.
	Eske.
	Erne.
	Drowes or Bundrowes.
	Duff or Bunduff.
	Oily.
	Fintragh.
	Bungosteen or Loughead.
Letterkenny,	Crann or Buncrana.
	Mill.
	Leanan or Rathmelton.
	Swilly.
	Owenmarve.
	Gweebarra.
	Owenea.
	Owentocker.
	Bracky.
	Lackagh.
	Ray.
	Tullaghobegly.
	Glenna.
	Clady.
	Gweedore.
Londonderry,	Foyle.
	Roe.
	Culdaff.
Coleraine,	Bann.
Ballycastle,	Glenarm.
	Glenariffe (Red Bay).
	Dall or Cushendall.
	Glendun or Cushendun.
	Margy or Ballycastle.
	Bush or Bushmills.
Drogheda,	Boyne.
Dundalk,	Glyde and Dee, or Annagassen.
	Fane.
	Castletown or Dundalk.
	Piedmont.
	Quoile.
	Dundrum.
	Shimna or Tollymore.
	Annalong.
	Kilkeel.
	Causeway Water.

APPENDIX, No. 18.

APPENDIX, No. 18.

BY-LAWS, ORDERS, &c., made by the INSPECTORS of IRISH FISHERIES, up to 31st March, 1876.

District.	Places affected.	Nature of By-law, Order, &c.	Date.
Belfast Lough,	Lough of Belfast,	Repealing by-law of 16th February, 1857, prohibiting trawling in certain part of.	27th November, 1869.
Ditto,	Ditto,	Prohibiting trawling in certain part of,	27th November, 1869.
Lough Swilly,	Lough Swilly,	Repealing by-law of 27th June, 1844, prohibiting trawling.	3rd December, 1869.
Ballycastle,	Bush River,	Repealing the definition of the estuary of,	28th February, 1870.
Sligo,	Sligo River,	Prohibiting snatching,	1st March, 1870.
Killarney,	Fishing weir in Waterville River.	Regulating the width between the bars or rails of the inscales, and of the heck, or the up-stream side of the boxes or cribs in said weir.	7th March, 1870.
Bantry,	Tidal portions of rivers,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1¾ inches from knot to knot.	7th March, 1870.
Kenmare River,	Kenmare River,	Repealing by-law of 10th November, 1865, prohibiting trawling in Kenmare.	19th March, 1870.
Ballina,	District,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1½ inches from knot to knot.	21st May, 1870.
Ditto,	Cloonaghmore or Palmerstown River.	Re-defining the mouth and estuary of,	16th June, 1870.
Waterford,	River Corock (above Wellington Bridge).	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot for capture of fish during open season for salmon and trout.	7th July, 1870.
Coleraine,	District,	Prohibiting snatching,	17th October, 1870.
Wexford,	Derrywater and River Derry,	Permitting the use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot.	26th October, 1870.
Ditto,	Potter River,	Ditto, in tidal portion of said river.	26th October, 1870.
Donegal Bay,	Donegal Bay,	Repealing by-law of 16th February, 1857, prohibiting trawling; save so far as it relates to Inver Bay.	15th November, 1870.
Limerick,	Fergus River,	Prohibiting the use of drift nets in tideway of,	16th December, 1870.
Ballina,	Moy River,	Prohibiting angling for trout in April and May,	11th February, 1871.
Ballyshannon,	Erne River,	Permitting the use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot in tideway of.	13th February, 1871.
Killarney,	Waterville River,	Prohibiting netting in certain places and at certain times,	18th February, 1871.
Coleraine,	Lough Neagh,	Permitting pollen to be taken by trammel nets of 1 inch from 1st February to 31st October.	20th February, 1871.
Londonderry,	Lough Foyle and tidal parts of River Foyle,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot.	28th February, 1871.
Limerick,	Maigue River,	Prohibiting use of nets (except landing nets), above railway bridge below Adare.	1st March, 1871.
Sligo,	Lough Doon,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of ½ an inch from knot to knot.	24th March, 1871.
Cork,	Lee River,	Prohibiting use of nets (except landing nets), in South Channel.	21st April, 1871.
Londonderry,	Baronscourt Lakes and Streams.	Permitting nets with meshes of ½ an inch from knot to knot for capture of fish.	22nd April, 1871.
Bantry,	Snave, Mealagh, Ouvane, and Carrigboy Rivers.	Prohibiting use of all nets (except landing nets), in fresh water portions.	21st June, 1871.
Skibbereen,	Glandore Harbour,	Repealing by-law, relative to trawling, dated 11th September, 1861.	11th November, 1871.
Limerick,	River Shannon,	Prohibiting nets on board any cot or curragh between mouth of Shannon and Wellesley Bridge, or in tidal parts of estuaries between said points, between Nine o'Clock on Saturday morning and Three o'Clock on Monday morning; also between Wellesley Bridge and Navigation Weir at Killaloe, between Eight o'Clock on Saturday morning and Four o'Clock on Monday morning.	1st March, 1872.
Dundalk,	Between Clogher Head and Bellaghan Point.	Limiting length of nets for salmon and trout to 500 yards,	29th April, 1872.
Ballyshannon,	River Erne,	Prohibiting spoon-bait, &c., in certain portions of,	1st June, 1872.
Ditto,	River Eany-water or Inver,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot, above mouth as defined.	25th June, 1872.
Cork,	Kinsale Harbour and Bandon River.	Regulating the oyster fisheries of said harbour and river.	22nd August, 1872.
Limerick,	Tralee Bay,	Regulating the oyster fisheries of said bay,	1st November, 1872.
Dundalk,	Between Dunany Point and Soldiers Point.	Prohibiting the use of the spear, lyster, otter, strokehaul, gaff, &c.	30th June, 1873.
Drogheda and Dundalk (East Coast).	Between Ben Head and mouth of Annagassan River.	Prohibiting the use of draw or wade nets with meshes of less dimensions than 3½ inches from knot to knot.	22nd October, 1873.
Dundalk,	Strangford Lough,	Prohibiting the use of poke nets between last day of January and 1st day of November in each year north of a line drawn from Mullog Point to Ballyquintin Point.	1st December, 1873.
Waterford,	Waterford Harbour,	Repealing by-law, dated 18th June, 1860, and in lieu thereof prohibiting trawling by vessels exceeding ten tons north of a line drawn from Gaultier Cottage to Broomhill Point.	15th December, 1873.

APPENDIX, No. 18—*continued.*

BY-LAWS, ORDERS, &c., made by the INSPECTORS of IRISH FISHERIES, up to 31st March, 1876—*con.*

District.	Places affected.	Nature of By-law, Order, &c.	Date.
Letterkenny,	Between Dunaff Head and DunmoreHead, and around the shores of Inishtrahull.	Prohibiting use of draw or wade nets for capture of white sea fish.	30th January, 1874.
Skibbereen,	River Ilen,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1¼ inches from knot to knot for capture of salmon or trout.	28th February, 1874.
Donegal Bay,	Donegal Bay,	Repealing by-law of 24th February, 1860, prohibiting use of nets with meshes less than 1 inch for capture of fish on that part of the coast of the county of Donegal inside or to the north-east and north of lines drawn from Rossan Point to Teelin Head, and from Teelin Head to Carrigan Head, and from Carrigan Head to Muckross Point, all in the barony of Bannagh, and county of Donegal.	21st April, 1874.
Ballyshannon,	Lower Lough Erne,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot for capture of fish by persons having right to use nets in said Lough between Enniskillen and Belleek between 1st May and first day of close season in each year.	30th June, 1874.
Dublin,	Between Dalkey Island and Wicklow Head.	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot for capture of salmon or trout.	15th October, 1874.
Lismore,	River Blackwater, &c.	Repealing by-law of 2nd November, 1870, regulating drift net fishing, and in lieu thereof providing as follows:—1st. That no drift nets of greater length than 200 yards shall be used for the capture of salmon and trout in the rivers or estuaries flowing into the sea between Helvick Head and Ballycotton, or in the sea between those points. 2nd. That no two or more drift nets when fishing shall be attached together in any way. 3rd. That drift nets shall not be used at a less distance from each other than 50 yards in that portion of the River Blackwater situated within one mile of mouth of the river as at present defined, each drift net shot and drifting to be kept at a distance of not less than 50 yards from the one preceding it on the tide and already drifting.	6th November, 1874.
Limerick,	Rivers Shannon, Maigue, and Askeaton, and Clonderlaw Bay.	Regulating the use of drift nets as follows:—1st. That no drift nets of greater length than 100 yards shall be used for the capture of salmon or trout in any part of the River Shannon between Limerick and a line drawn across the river below Askeaton, from Aughnish Point, in the county of Limerick, to Kildysart, in the county of Clare. 2nd. That no drift nets of greater length than 200 yards shall be used for the capture of salmon or trout in any other tidal waters of the River Shannon, or in Clonderlaw Bay. 3rd. That no two or more drift nets shall be attached together in any way or be allowed to drift within 150 yards of each other in the River Shannon, or in Clonderlaw Bay. 4th. That no drift nets below or seaward of a line drawn across the River Shannon, from Aughnish Point, in the county of Limerick, to Kildysart, in the county of Clare, shall be used within the line of low water mark of ordinary spring tides. 5th. That no drift nets shall be used in Clonderlaw Bay above a line drawn from Knock to Lacknabahee, in the county of Clare. 6th. That no drift nets shall be used in the rivers Maigue or Askeaton.	10th November, 1874.
Cork,	Bandon River and Tributaries.	Prohibiting for five years, from the 1st January, 1875, the use of all nets (except landing nets as auxiliary to angling with rod and line) for the capture of salmon or trout in any part of said river or its tributaries, above a line drawn across the said river at right angles with the river's course, from the stream on the east side of said river dividing the townlands of Coolmoreen and Skeamogue, to the stream on the opposite shore dividing the townlands of Drumkeen and Knockroe.	10th December, 1874.
Wexford,	River Owenavorragh,	Permitting use of nets with meshes of 1 inch from knot to knot for capture of salmon or trout.	15th February, 1875.
Waterford,	River Suir,	Prohibiting use of all engines (save single rods and lines) for capture of fish between the bridges at Suir Island and a line drawn due south across the river and intersecting said island at Clonmel.	17th August, 1875.
Limerick,	River Shannon, Poulnasherry Bay.	Prohibiting for two years from date of order the dredging for or taking oysters in said bay, north of a line drawn from Baurnahard Point to Querrin Point in the county Clare.	31st July, 1875.
*Letterkenny,	Lough Swilly,	By-Laws, Rules, &c., regulating the Oyster Fisheries,	15th February, 1876.
*Limerick,	River Shannon,	Ditto, ditto,	29th February, 1876.
*Ditto,	Tralee Bay,	Ditto, ditto,	29th February, 1876.
*Cork,	Cork Harbour,	Ditto, ditto, and repealing By-Laws, Rules, &c., dated 28th October, 1853.	29th February, 1876.
*Ditto,	River Lee,	Prohibiting the use of the spear, lyster, otter, &c., for capture of fish in tidal waters, &c., of said river.	31st March, 1876.

* These By-Laws have been passed by the Inspectors and are now before the Privy Council for approval.

APPENDIX, No. 19.

Abstract of By-Laws, Orders, &c.

APPENDIX, No. 19.

ABSTRACT of BY-LAWS, ORDERS, &c., in force on 1st January, 1876, relating to the FISHERIES of IRELAND.

Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.
	TRAWLING.
Dublin, . . (10th Oct., 1842.)	Prohibiting Trawling inside lines drawn from the Bailey Light-house at Howth, to the Eastern-most point of the rocks called the "Mugglins;" thence by a straight line to the Southern point of Dalkey Island; thence by a straight line across Dalkey Sound, in the direction of the signal station on Killiney Hill.
East Coast, . . (14th Feb., 1851.)	Prohibiting Trawling within a line drawn from the Nose of Howth, to the Eastern point of St. Patrick's Island (Skerries); thence to Clogher Head; thence to Dunany Point; thence to Cranfield Point, in the County Down.
Dundrum Bay, &c., (3rd Dec., 1851.)	Prohibiting Trawling from Hellyhunter Rock, off Cranfield Point, to St. John's Point, both in the County Down.
Donegal Bay, . (16th Feb., 1857.)	Prohibiting Trawling within a straight line from the Bian Rock, to a place called Doorin Point.
Galway Bay, . . (22nd March, 1843, and 9th Jan., 1854.)	Prohibiting Trawling within a line from Barna Pier to Gleninagh Castle. Also when large shoals of Herrings shall have set in in the Bay, and while Boats are engaged in Drifting for Herrings or Mackerel, and when Boats shall commence Fishing for Herrings or Mackerel, that Trawl Boats shall keep at a distance of three miles from them.
Brandon Bay, . (23rd Aug., 1860.)	Prohibiting Trawling within a line drawn from Brandon Point to Coosanea.
Bantry Bay, . . (27th March, 1858.)	Prohibiting Trawling within a straight line from Crowdy Point to Carrigskye Rock; and from thence to Reenavanny Point, on the North Shore of Whiddy Island.
	Prohibiting Trawling between sunset and sunrise.
Waterford Harbour, 15th Dec., 1873.	Prohibiting Trawling by Boats exceeding ten tons measurement, within a line drawn from Gaultier Cottage, County Waterford, to Broomhill Point, County Wexford.
Wexford Coast, . (20th April, 1849.)	Prohibiting Trawling in all places where there are Boats engaged in Herring or Mackerel Drift Net Fishing; and that Trawl Boats shall keep at a distance of at least three miles from all boats fishing for Herrings or Mackerel, with Drift Nets. And whenever Herring or Mackerel Boats shall commence Drift Net Fishing in any place, on or off the Coast of Wexford, the Trawl Boats shall depart therefrom, and keep at least three miles distant from the Drift Net Herring or Mackerel Boats.
Belfast Lough, . (27th Nov., 1869.)	Prohibiting Trawling in that part of said Lough of Belfast comprised within a straight line drawn from the Castle of Carrickfergus, in the County of the Town of Carrickfergus, to Rockport, in the County of Down, between the hours of Six o'Clock in the Evening and Six o'Clock in the Morning, during the Months of December, January, and February.
	TRAMMEL NETS.
Dungarvan Bay, . (4th July, 1849.)	Prohibiting the use of Trammel and every other Fixed or Moored Net (except Bag or other Nets for the taking of Salmon) in Dungarvan Bay, within the limit formed as follows, namely, the space lying between a line passing due East and West, through the Northernmost point of Helvick Head, and a line passing due East and West through the Southernmost point of Ballinacourty Head, in the Co. Waterford; but to the North and East of the line through Ballinacourty Head, and to the South and West of the line through Helvick Head, such Trammel or Moored Nets may be set, and remain set in the water from Three o'Clock, p.m., of one day, until Nine o'Clock, a.m., in the following day, during January, March, October, November, and December in each Year; and from Five o'Clock, p.m., of one day, to Seven o'Clock, a.m., in the following day, during May, June, July, August, and September. Also prohibiting such Nets athwart or within 200 yards of any boat, which at the time of setting such net shall be moored, and the Crew thereof engaged in Line Fishing; and to every train of such Trammel or Moored Nets shall be attached at least one floating buoy or board, upon which shall be painted in legible characters not less than one inch in length, in white upon a black ground, the Letter of the District, and the name of the Owner to which such Net belongs.
Inver Bay, . . (24th Sept., 1860.)	Prohibiting the use of Trammel Nets within or to the North-east of a line drawn from the Mouth of the Bunlaghy River to Doorin Point.
Kenmare River Estuary, (31st Dec., 1864.)	Within the Estuary of the Kenmare River, in the County of Kerry, and eastward of a line drawn from the western point of Lamb's Head to the western point of Cod's Head, the use of Trammel and other Moored Nets for the capture of Sea Fish is authorized and permitted, from the hour of Three o'Clock in the Afternoon of any one day to the hour of Nine o'Clock in the Morning of the day next following, during the months of October, November, December, January, February, and March, in each year; and from the hour of Five o'Clock in the Afternoon of any one day to the hour of Seven o'Clock in the Morning of the day following, during the months of April, May, June, July, August, and September.
	OYSTERS.
Wexford Coast, . (8th April, 1862.)	First.—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking Oysters off the said Wexford Coast, south of Raven Point, shall cull all such Oysters as may be taken or caught; and shall not remove from any Fishing Ground or Oyster Bed any Oyster of less dimensions than three inches, at the greatest diameter thereof, and shall immediately throw back into the Sea all Oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing; and no person shall take from any Oyster Bed, Rock, Strand, or Shore, off said Wexford Coast, south of Raven Point, any Oyster of less dimensions than three inches, at the greatest diameter thereof; and any person offending in any respect against this By-Law, Rule, or Regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds. Second.—All persons are hereby prohibited from throwing into the Sea, on any Oyster Bed, or Oyster Fishing Ground off the said Wexford Coast, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the Oyster Fishery; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.
Cork Harbour,* . (28th Oct., 1853.)	First.—That between the 1st May and 1st September, no boat shall have on board any dredge or other implement for taking Oysters. Second.—Every fisherman shall, on the fishing ground, cull all Oysters, and shall not remove any Oyster of less dimensions than two and a-half inches at the greatest diameter thereof; and shall throw back into the Sea all gravel and fragments of shells as he shall raise while engaged in such fishing. Third.—All persons are prohibited from throwing into the Sea, on any Oyster Bed or Oyster Fishing Ground, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious to the Oyster Fishery. Fourth.—No person shall, between Sunset and Sunrise, dredge for, take, or catch any Oysters within the Harbour of Cork.
Tralee Bay, . . (1st Nov., 1872.)	First.—That between the 10th day of March and the 1st day of November in any year, being the Close Season for Oysters in the said Bay of Tralee, no boat, in the said Bay of Tralee, shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters; and if, between the periods aforesaid, there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds. Second.—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking Oysters in said Bay of Tralee, shall cull all such Oysters as may be taken or caught; and shall not remove from any fishing ground or Oyster Bed any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof, and shall immediately throw back into the Sea all Oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, or shore of said Bay of Tralee, any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof; and any person offending in any respect against this By-Law, Rule, or Regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.

* A by-law repealing this has been passed by the Inspectors, and is now before the Privy Council for approval.

APPENDIX, No. 19—*continued.*

ABSTRACT of BY-LAWS, ORDERS, &c., in force on 1st January, 1876, relating to the FISHERIES of IRELAND.

Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.	Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.
Achill Sound, Clew Bay, & Blacksod Bay. (15th Dec., 1860.)	First.—That between the 1st day of April and the 1st day of October in any year, being the Close Season for Oysters in said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay, no boat, in the said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay, shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters; and if, between the periods aforesaid, there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds.	Coasts of Dublin, Wicklow and Wexford. (23rd April, 1869.) Approved by Her Majesty in Council, 29th April, 1869.	Prohibiting between the 30th April and 1st September in each year the dredging for, taking, catching, or destroying any Oyster or Oyster Brood on or off any part of the East and South-East Coast of Ireland, within the distance of Twenty Miles measured from a straight line drawn from the Eastern point of Lambay Island, in the County Dublin, to Carnsore Point, in the County Wexford, outside the exclusive Fishery Limits of the British Islands.
	Second.—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking Oysters in said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay, shall cull all such Oysters as may be taken or caught; and shall not remove from any Fishing Ground or Oyster Bed any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof, and shall immediately throw back into the Sea all Oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, bed, or shore of said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay, any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof; and any person offending in any respect against this By-Law, Rule, or Regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.	Kinsale Harbour and Bandon River. (22nd August, 1872.)	That all persons fishing for or taking Oysters in any part of the Fishing Grounds or Oyster Beds situated in Kinsale Harbour and Bandon River, in the County of Cork, shall cull all such Oysters as may be taken or caught, and shall not remove from such Fishing Grounds or Oyster Beds any Oyster of less dimensions than three inches at the greatest diameter thereof, but shall immediately throw back into the water all Oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid; and any person offending in any respect against this By-Law shall for each such offence forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.
	Third.—All persons are hereby prohibited from throwing into the Sea, on any Oyster Bed, or Oyster Fishing Ground in said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the Oyster Fishery; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.		SALMON AND TROUT.
	Fourth.—No person shall, between sunset and sunrise, dredge for, take, or catch, any Oysters within said Clew Bay, Achill Sound, and Blacksod Bay; and every person acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds.	River Liffey, . (19th Jan., 1865.)	Prohibiting the catching, or attempting to catch, Salmon with any Net of greater length than 350 yards, in that part of the River Liffey which is situated between the Weir known as the Island Bridge Weir and a line drawn due North from Poolbeg Lighthouse.
Carlingford Lough. (17th April, 1860.)	First.—That between the 1st day of March and 1st day of November in any year, it shall not be lawful for any person to dredge for, take, catch, or destroy any Oysters or Oyster Brood within the said Lough of Carlingford, or off or from any of the shores or rocks of said Lough, and any person offending against this By-Law shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds.	River Slaney, Co. Wexford. (25th March, 1854, and 4th March, 1862.)	Prohibiting, during the Close Season for Salmon, the use of Nets of any kind whatsoever, between Ferrycarrig Bridge and the Town of Enniscorthy.
			Prohibiting, during the Open Season for Salmon, the use of Nets with meshes of less size than one and three-quarter inches from knot to knot, between Ferrycarrig Bridge and the Town of Enniscorthy.
		Bessborough Demesne, Co. Kilkenny. (5th May, 1866.)	Permitting the use of Nets for the capture of Fish with Meshes of one inch from knot to knot (to be measured along the side of the square, or four inches to be measured all round each such Mesh, such measurements being taken in the clear, when the Net is wet,) within the Waters in, and Rivers running through the Demesne of Bessborough, in the County of Kilkenny: Provided that no Net having a less Mesh than one inch and three-quarters from knot to knot, shall be used in the said Rivers during the Months of April, May, and June.
	Second.—That between the 1st day of March and the 1st day of November in any year, no boat, in the said Lough of Carlingford, shall have on board any dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters; and if, between the periods aforesaid, there shall be on board any boat any such dredge or other implement for the taking of Oysters, the master or owner of such boat shall, for each such offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Five Pounds.	Cork District, . (11th Sept., 1866.)	Prohibiting the catching or attempting to catch Salmon or Trout in any Tidal Water in the Cork District with a Spear, Lyster, Otter, Strokehaul, Dree Draw, or Gaff, except when the latter instrument may be used solely as auxiliary to angling with Rod and Line, or for the purpose of removing Fish from any legal Weir or Box by the Owner or Occupier thereof.
			Prohibiting the snatching or attempting to snatch Salmon or Trout in any Tidal or Fresh Water in the Cork District with any kind of Fish-hook, covered in part or in whole with any matter or thing, or uncovered.
	Third.—All persons engaged in fishing for or taking Oysters in said Lough of Carlingford, shall cull all such Oysters as may be taken or caught; and shall not remove from any Fishing Ground or Oyster Bed any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof, and shall immediately throw back into the Sea all Oysters of less dimensions than aforesaid, as well as all gravel and fragments of shells as shall be raised or taken while engaged in such fishing; and no person shall take from any rock, strand, or shore of said Lough of Carlingford, any Oyster of less dimensions than two inches and one-half, at the greatest diameter thereof; and any person offending in any respect against this By-Law, Rule, or Regulation shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.	River Lee, Co. of the City of Cork. (7th January, 1863.)	Prohibiting, during the Close Season for Salmon the use of Draft Nets, or any other Net or Nets used as a Draft Net, having a foot-rope and leads or weights affixed thereto, within the following limits, viz.:—in that part of the River Lee, situate between Patrick's Bridge, in the City of Cork, and a line drawn across the said River Lee, from Blackrock Castle, on the south, to the Western extremity of the Townland of Dunkettle, on the North.
		Argideen River, . (24th Feb., 1860.)	Prohibiting the use of Nets of any kind whatsoever in the tidal part of the river known as the Argideen River, in the County of Cork, situated between the junction of the Owenkeagh or Blind River with the said Argideen River and the Bridge of Timoleague, all in the Barony of the East Division of East Carbery, and County of Cork.
	Fourth.—All persons are hereby prohibited from throwing into the Sea, on any Oyster Bed, or Oyster Fishing Ground in the said Lough of Carlingford, the ballast of any boat, or any other matter or thing injurious or detrimental to the Oyster Fishery; and all persons acting contrary hereto shall, for each offence, forfeit and pay a sum of Two Pounds.	River Shannon, . (5th Feb., 1856.)	Prohibiting Net Fishing in that part of the River Shannon between Wellesley Bridge and the Railway Bridge, between 1st June and 12th February.
South-east Coast of Ireland, from Wicklow Head to Carnsore Point. (1st Sept., 1868.)	That the Close Time, during which it shall not be lawful to dredge for, take, catch, or destroy any Oysters or Oyster Brood, on or off the South-east coast of Ireland, between Wicklow Head and Carnsore Point, shall be between the 30th April and the 1st September in each year.	River Shannon, . (22nd Nov., 1862.)	First.—Prohibiting, between the 20th day of July and 1st day of November in each year, the use of Draft Nets, or any other Net or Nets used as a Draft Net, having a foot-rope and leads or weights affixed thereto, within the following limits, viz.:—in that part of the River

Appendix, No. 19.

Abstract of By-Laws, Orders, &c.

Appendix, No. 19—*continued.*

Abstract of By-Laws, Orders, &c., in force on 1st January, 1876, relating to the Fisheries of Ireland.

Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.	Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.
River Shannon —*continued.*	Shannon situate between the Fishing Weir known as the Lax Weir, and a line drawn due North and South across the said River Shannon at the Western extremity of Graigue Island. Second.—Prohibiting Draft Nets for the capture of Fish of any kind, of a mesh less than one and three-quarter inches from knot to knot, to be measured along the side of the square, or seven inches to be measured all round each such mesh, such measurements being taken in the clear when the Net is wet, in the tidal parts of the River Shannon, or in the tidal parts of any of the Rivers flowing into the said River Shannon.	Sligo River, . . (1st March, 1870.)	Prohibiting the snatching or attempting snatch, Salmon in Sligo River, with any kin of Fish-hook covered in part or in whole, uncovered.
		Currane or Waterville River—Waterville Weir. (7th March, 1870.)	Permitting the space between the Bars or Rai of the Inscales, and of the Heck or upstrea side of the Boxes or Cribs of the Watervil Weir to be one and a quarter inches apart.
		Bush River, . . (28th Feb., 1870.)	Repealing Definition of Bush River Estuary fixed by the late Special Commissioners on 8 February, 1864.
Rivers Shannon and Maigue. (5th June, 1867.)	Prohibiting the Shooting of Fish in that part of River Shannon between Portumna Bridge and Shannon Bridge, and also in River Maigue.	Rivers in Bantry District. (7th March, 1870.)	Permitting use of Nets of a Mesh of one and quarter inches from knot to knot (to measured along the side of the square, or fi inches to be measured all round each su Mesh, such measurement being taken in th clear when the Net is wet), in the tidal wate of the Bantry District, which comprises th whole of the sea along the coast between Miz Head in the County Cork and CrowHead the same County, and around any Islands Rocks situate off same, with the whole of th Tideways along said Coast and Rivers, and th whole of the tidal portions of the several Rive and their Tributaries flowing into said Coast.
River Shannon, . (5th May, 1866.)	Prohibiting the Fishing for Salmon or Trout by any means whatsoever, within a space of Twenty Yards from the Weir Wall of Tarmonbarry, on the River Shannon.		
Lough Ree, River Shannon. (27th August, 1858.)	Permitting the use of Nets in Lough Ree, having a mesh of five inches in the round, measured when the Net is wet.		
River Fergus, . (26th June, 1865.)	Prohibiting the Fishing for Salmon or Trout by any means whatsoever, within a space of Twenty Yards from the Weir Wall of Ennis, on the River Fergus.	Ballina District, . (21st May, 1870.)	Permitting use of Nets with Meshes of or and a quarter inches from knot to knot (to measured along the side of the square, or fi inches to be measured all round each su Mesh, such measurements being taken in th clear, when the Net is wet).
River Maigue, . (17th Oct., 1864.)	Prohibiting the use of Draft Nets between Ferry Drawbridge and the old Bridge of Adare.		
Killarney District, (8th Feb., 1865.)	Prohibiting the catching, or attempting to catch, Salmon in any tidal water with a Spear, Lyster, Otter, Strokehaul, Dree-Draw, or Gaff, except when the latter instrument may be used solely as auxiliary to angling with rod and line, or for the purpose of removing fish from any legal Weir or Box by the owner or occupier thereof.	Waterford District, Corrock River. (7th July, 1870.)	Permitting use of Nets with Meshes of one in from knot to knot (to be measured along th side of the square, or four inches to be measur all round such Mesh, such measurements bei taken in the clear when the Net is wet).
		Coleraine District, . (17th Oct., 1870.)	Prohibiting snatching or attempting to snat Salmon in any of the tidal or fresh waters District.
Castlemaine Estuary, (27th Oct., 1858.)	Prohibiting, during the Salmon Close Season, the use of Draft Nets having a foot-rope and leads or weights affixed thereto, in the Estuary of Castlemaine inside the Bar of Inch.	Wexford District, Derry Water, and River Derry. (26th Oct., 1870.)	Permitting use of Nets for the capture of Fis having Meshes of one inch from knot to kn (to be measured along the side of the square, four inches, to be measured all round each su Mesh, such measurements being taken in th clear when the Net is wet), in the rivers an streams following, that is to say, in the Der Water, from its source near Killaveney Annacurragh Bridge, with the stream flowin into same from Moyne Church through Balli glen, and the Tomnaskela River; and in th Greenisland, Shillelagh, and Derry River, fro the bounds of the County Carlow, flowing pa Tinnahely by Shillelagh to the bounds of th County Wexford, with the small strean flowing into that portion of the said river, s said rivers and streams being in the Coun Wicklow, for and during the months of Ma June, July, and August, in each year.
Lough Neagh, . (22nd April, 1846, and 24th Feb., 1860.)	Permitting Pollen to be taken by Trammel or Set Nets composed of Thread or Yarn of a fine texture, not less than ten hanks to the pound weight, doubled and twisted with a mesh of not less than one inch from knot to knot, from the 1st of March to the 29th September.		
Lough Neagh, . (28th Feb., 1867.)	Prohibiting the use of Draft Nets for the capture of Pollen.		
Galway River, Lough Corrib, &c. (24th July, 1846.)	Prohibiting the use of the Instrument, commonly called Strokehaul or Snatch, or any other such instrument, in River Galway, Loughs Corrib or Mask, or their Tributaries.		
Galway District, . (11th Sept., 1866.)	Prohibiting the snatching or attempt to snatch Salmon in any Tidal or Fresh Water in the Galway District with any kind of Fish-hook, covered in part or in whole with any matter or thing, or uncovered.	Wexford District, Potter River. (26th Oct., 1870.)	Permitting use of Nets for the capture of Fis with Meshes of one inch from knot to knot (be measured along the side of the square, four inches to be measured all round each su Mesh, such measurements being taken in th clear, when the Net is wet), in the tidal portio of the Potter River, situated below Britt Bridge in the County of Wicklow.
Clare and Clare-Galway or Turloughmore Rivers, Co. Galway. (22nd Dec., 1862.)	Prohibiting the use of Nets of any kind whatsoever in any part of the Rivers known as the Clare and the Clare-Galway or Turloughmore Rivers, in the County of Galway, above the junction of the said Rivers with Lough Corrib, in the County of Galway.	Fergus River, . (16th Dec., 1870.)	Prohibiting the use of Drift Nets in the Tid parts of River Fergus, County Clare.
Owenmore River, Co. Mayo. (5th May, 1866.)	Prohibiting the removal of gravel or sand from any part of the bed of the Owenmore River, in the County of Mayo, where the spawning of Salmon or Trout may take place.	Erne River, . . (13th Feb., 1871.)	Permitting use of Nets with meshes of one in from knot to knot in tideway of River Erne.
Owenduff or Ballycroy, Owenmore and Munhim Rivers. (11th Sept., 1866.)	Permitting the use of Nets with Meshes of one and a-half inches from knot to knot (to be measured along the side of the square, or six inches to be measured all round each such Mesh, such measurements being taken in the clear, when the Net is wet,) within so much of the said Rivers Owenduff or Ballycroy, Owenmore and Munhim, as lies above the mouth as defined, during so much of the Months of June, July, and August, as do now or at any time may form part of the Open Season for the capture of Salmon or Trout, with Nets, in the said Rivers.	Waterville River, . (18th Feb., 1871.)	Prohibiting use of Nets between Waterville We and mouth of River as defined, between twelv o'clock noon on Friday and six o'clock o Saturday morning, and between six o'cloc Monday morning and twelve o'clock noon sam day in each week during Open Season.
		Lough Neagh, . (20th Feb., 1871.)	Permitting pollen to be taken by tramm nets of one inch from knot to knot, betwee 1st February and 31st October.
		River Foyle, . (28th Feb., 1871.)	Permitting the use of Nets with meshes of on inch from knot to knot in Lough Foyle an tidal parts of River.

APPENDIX, No. 19—*continued.*

ABSTRACT of BY-LAWS, ORDERS, &c., in force on 1st January, 1876, relating to the FISHERIES of IRELAND.

Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.	Place affected by By-Law, and Date thereof.	Nature of By-Law.
Baronscourt Lakes and Streams. (22nd April, 1871.)	Permitting the use of Nets for the capture of fish, other than Salmon and Trout, with meshes of half an inch from knot to knot.	Donegal Bay, . (21st April, 1874.)	Repealing By-law of 24th February, 1860, prohibiting use of Nets with Meshes less than one inch for capture of Fish of any kind on that part of the coast of the County Donegal inside or to the north-east and north of lines drawn from Rossan Point to Teelin Head, and from Teelin Head to Carrigan Head, and from Carrigan Head to Muckross Point, all in the Barony of Bannagh and County of Donegal.
Snave or Coomhola, Mealagh, or Dunnamark, Owvane, and Carrigboy Rivers. (21st June, 1871.)	Prohibiting use of all Nets, save Landing-Nets, as auxiliary to rods and lines in fresh-water portions of said Rivers.		
Lee River, . . (21st April, 1871.)	Prohibiting use of all Nets, except Landing-Nets, as auxiliary to rods and lines in part of South Channel between George IV Bridge and Friar's Weir.	Ballyshannon District, Lower Lough Erne. (30th June, 1874.)	Permitting use of nets with meshes of one inch from knot to knot for capture of fish by persons having right to use nets in said lough, between Enniskillen and Belleek, between 1st May and first day of close season in each year.
Moy River and Tributaries. (11th Feb., 1871.)	Prohibiting angling for Trout during April and May in each year—Loughs Conn and Cullen excepted.		
Maigue River, . (1st March, 1871.)	Prohibiting use of all Nets, except Landing-Nets as auxiliary to rod and line, above Railway-bridge below Adare.	Dublin District, between Dalkey Island and Wicklow Head. (15th Oct., 1874.)	Permitting use of Nets with Meshes of one inch from knot to knot for capture of Salmon or Trout.
Lough Doon, . . (24th March, 1871.	Permitting use of Nets with meshes of half an inch from knot to knot, for capture of Fish.	Lismore District, River Blackwater, &c. (6th Nov., 1874.)	Repealing By-law of 2nd November, 1870, regulating Drift Net Fishing, and in lieu thereof providing as follows :—
River Shannon, . (1st March, 1872.)	Prohibiting having Nets for capture of Salmon or Trout on board any Cot or Curragh between mouth of Shannon and Wellesley Bridge, in the city of Limerick, or in tidal parts of any rivers flowing into the said River Shannon between said points between the hours of Nine o'clock on Saturday morning and Three o'clock on Monday morning; or between Wellesley Bridge and the Navigation Weir at Killaloe, in the County of Clare, between Eight o'clock on Saturday morning and Four o'clock on Monday morning.		First.—That no Drift Nets of greater length than 200 yards shall be used for the capture of Salmon and Trout in the Rivers or Estuaries flowing into the sea between Helvick Head and Ballycotton, or in the sea between those points. Second.—That no two or more Drift Nets when fishing shall be attached together in any way. Third.—That Drift Nets shall not be used at a less distance from each other than fifty yards in that portion of the River Blackwater situated within one mile of the mouth of the River as at present defined, each Drift Net shot and drifting to be kept at a distance of not less than fifty yards from the one preceding it on the tide and already drifting.
Dundalk District, . (29th April, 1872.)	Prohibiting to catch or attempting to catch Salmon or Trout with any Net of greater length than 500 Yards on that part of the Sea Coast situated between Clogher Head and Ballaghan Point, in the County of Louth.		
Erne River, . . (1st June 1872.)	Prohibiting the capture of Fish of any description with the instrument commonly called and known by the name of the Spoonbait, or any other instrument of the like nature or device during the months of January, February, and March in each year, in that part of the River Erne situated between the Falls of Belleek and a line drawn due south across the River, from the point of Castlecaldwell demesne, by the Eastern point of the Muckinish, or White Island, to the opposite Bank, all in the County of Fermanagh.	Rivers Shannon, Maigue, and Askeaton, and Clonderlaw Bay. (10th Nov., 1874.)	Regulating the use of Drift Nets as follows :— First.—That no Drift Nets of greater length than 100 yards shall be used for the capture of Salmon or Trout in any part of the River Shannon between Limerick and a line drawn across the River below Askeaton, from Aughnish Point, in the County of Limerick, to Kildysart, in the County of Clare. Second.—That no Drift Nets of greater length than 200 yards shall be used for the capture of Salmon or Trout in any other Tidal Waters of the River Shannon, or in Clonderlaw Bay. Third.—That no two or more Drift Nets shall be attached together in any way or be allowed to drift within 150 yards of each other in the River Shannon, or in Clonderlaw Bay. Fourth.—That no Drift Nets below or seaward of a line drawn across the River Shannon, from Aughnish Point, in the County of Limerick, to Kildysart, in the County of Clare, shall be used within the line of low water mark of ordinary Spring Tides. Fifth.—That no Drift Nets shall be used in Clonderlaw Bay above a line drawn from Knock to Lacknabahee, in the County of Clare. Sixth.—That no Drift Nets shall be used in the Rivers Maigue or Askeaton.
Eany Water, or Inver River. (25th June, 1872.)	Permitting use of Nets for the capture of Fish with Meshes of one inch from knot to knot (to be measured along the side of the square, or four inches to be measured all round each such Mesh, such measurements being taken in the clear when the Net is wet), within so much of the River Eany Water, or Inver, in the County of Donegal, as lies above the mouth of said river as defined.		
Dundalk District, . (30th June, 1873.)	Prohibiting the catching or attempting to catch Salmon in any Tidal water of District between Dunany Point and Soldier's Point, in the County Louth, with a Spear, Lyster, Otter, Strokehaul, Dree-draw, or Gaff, except when the latter may be used solely as auxiliary to angling with Rod and Line, or for removing fish from any legal Weir or Box by the Owner or Occupier thereof.	Bandon River, . (10th Dec., 1874.)	Prohibiting for five years from the 1st January, 1875, the use of all Nets (except Landing Nets as anxiliary to angling with Rod and Line) for the capture of Salmon or Trout in any part of said River or its Tributaries, above a line drawn across the said River at right angles with the River's course from the Stream on the east side of said River, dividing the Townlands of Coolmoreen and Skeamogue to the Stream on the opposite shore dividing the Townlands of Drumkeen and Knockroe.
Drogheda & Dundalk Districts (East Coast). (22nd Oct., 1873.)	Prohibiting use of Draw or Wade Nets with Meshes less than three and a half inches for capture of Fish between Ben Head and mouth of Annagassan River.		
Dundalk District, Strangford Lough. (1st Dec., 1873.)	Prohibiting use of Poke Nets for capture of Fish inside a line drawn across said Lough, from Mullog Point on the west to Ballyquintin Point on the east, between the last day of January and first day of November in each year.	Wexford District, Owenavorragh River. (15th Feb., 1875.)	Permitting use of nets with meshes of one inch from knot to knot for capture of salmon or trout.
Sea Coast, Co. Donegal. (30th Jan., 1874.)	Prohibiting use of Draw or Wade Nets for capture of Fish between Dunaff Head and Dunmore Head, and tidal parts of rivers flowing into the sea between said points and around the shores of Inishtrohull.	River Suir, . . (17th Aug., 1875.)	Prohibiting use of all Engines (save single Rods and Lines) for capture of Fish, between the Bridges at Suir Island and a line drawn due south across the River, and intersecting said Island at Clonmel.
River Ilen, . . (28th Feb., 1874.)	Permitting use of Nets with Meshes of one and a quarter inches from knot to knot for capture of Salmon or Trout.		

Appendix, No. 20.

Appendix, Nos. 20, 21.

A Summary of Certificates for Fixed Engines issued by the late Special Commissioners for Irish Fisheries and the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, up to 1st January, 1876.

Certificates.	Stake Nets.	Bag Nets.	Fly Nets.	Head Weirs.	Stone Walls or Baulks.	Fixed Draft Nets.	Total.	Remarks.
Total issued to 1st January, 1876,	–	–	–	–	–	–	118	
Issued by Special Commissioners,	6	22	1	3	2	–	34	These 118 certificates issued up to 1st January, 1876, represent—
,, Inspectors of Irish Fisheries for Engines declared legal by Special Commissioners,	–	3	–	–	–	2	5	44 stake nets. 53 bag nets. 1 fly net. 3 head weirs. 2 baulks. 66 fixed draft nets.
,, Inspectors for those declared legal by Court of Queen's Bench on appeal from decision of Special Commissioners,	24	3	–	–	–	–	27	
,, Inspectors for Engines declared legal by Court on appeal from decision of Magistrates,	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	Total, 169 fixed engines, for which certificates have been sanctioned.
, Inspectors for Engines found by them to be legal,	12	8	–	–	–	31	51	
Total,	42	36	1	3	2	34	118	

Appendix, No. 21.

Rivers, the Tidal and Fresh Water Boundaries of which have been defined.

River.	Boundary.	Date.
Suir,	A line drawn across river at and opposite to the most up-stream part of the Coolnamuck Weir,	16th March, 1864.
Nore,	The Innistiogue Bridge,	16th March, 1864.
Barrow	The lowest Weir or Dam used for navigation purposes, near St. Mullins, in county Carlow,	16th March, 1864.
Shannon,	The Weir or Dam known as the Corbally Mill Weir,	9th April, 1864.
Fergus,	The Bridge commonly known as the New Bridge, immediately below the Club House, at Ennis,	9th April, 1864.
Liffey,	The Weir or Dam on said river known as the Island Bridge Weir,	12th August, 1864.
Maigue,	The Bridge across river immediately outside and seaward of the Adare Demesne,	12th August, 1864.
Lee,	The Weir or Dam at the Water Works of Cork, known as the Water Works Weir,	12th August, 1864.
Bandon,	The Bridge at Innoshannon, known as the Innoshannon Bridge,	19th January, 1865.
Carragh,	The Carragh Bridge, being the bridge immediately seaward of the Salmon Weir,	19th January, 1865.
Laune,	The shallow at the head of the Pool, commonly called the Cat Pool,	26th July, 1865.
Maine,	A straight line drawn across river at right angles with its course at the boundary between the townlands of Coolclieve and Ballyfinnane.	26th July, 1865.
Moy,	The foot of the falls immediately below the Weirs at Ballina,	26th July, 1865.
Inch,	Adare Bridge,	1st February, 1866.
Slaney,	Enniscorthy Bridge,	1st February, 1866.
Boyne,	Eastern Point of Grove Island at Oldbridge,	8th April, 1868.
Eask,	Foot Bridge above Donegal Bridge,	17th July, 1868.
Shimna,	The Castle Bridge near Newcastle,	25th August, 1869.
Deel or Askeaton,	Askeaton Bridge,	26th November, 1870.
Sligo or Garvogue,	The Mill Dam above Victoria Bridge, in town of Sligo,	11th February, 1871.
Fane,	The Railway Bridge across said River,	16th May, 1871.
Owvane or Ballylickey.	The Ballylickey Bridge on the High Road,	10th June, 1871.
Glengariffe,	Cromwell's Bridge,	10th June, 1871.
Mealagh or Dunnamark.	Wooden Bridge at Dunnamark Mill,	10th June, 1871.
Snave or Coomhola,	Snave Bridge,	10th June, 1871.
Carrigboy,	Carrigboy Bridge,	10th June, 1871.
Adrigole,	Adrigole Bridge,	10th June, 1871.
Glyde,	Lynn's Weir,	28th May, 1872.
Dee,	Willistown Weir,	28th May, 1872.
Bride,	Tallow Bridge Quay,	26th January, 1874.
Galey or Geale,	The Stream called and known by the name of the Gerah-Gloss, between the townlands of Gortacrossane and Beennameelane.	4th October, 1875.
Feale,	The Road leading through Killacrim from the Road leading from Listowel to Ennismore by a line drawn in continuation of said Killacrim Road.	4th October, 1875.
Bann,	The Down Stream end of Fishing Weir, known as the Cutts,	12th November, 1875.

Appendix, No. 22.

List of Licences Granted to Plant Oyster Beds up to 31st December, 1875.

Date of Licence.	Persons to whom Granted.	Locality of Beds.	Area of Beds. A.	R.	P.
1846, 5th November,	W. H. Carter, esq.	Tramore Bay, county Mayo,	19	1	11
1848, 9th June,	F. H. Downing,	Off Daurus Point, county Kerry,	3	2	28
1849, 24th February,	R. T. Evanson,	Dunmanus Bay, county Cork,	19	0	10
1851, 5th February,	John Mahony, esq.	Estuary of Kenmare River, county Kerry,	165	2	0
5th February,	Rev. Denis Mahony,	Estuary of Kenmare River, county Kerry,	147	2	0
1852, 17th November,	Thomas White, esq.	Ballisodare Bay, county Sligo,	132	1	26
17th November,	John C. Garvey, esq.	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	108	3	33
1853, 22nd September,	J. O. Woodhouse, esq.	Mulroy Bay, county Donegal,	63	0	26
1854, 1st July,	Burton Bindon, esq.	Carlingford Lough, county Louth,	51	3	10
15th November,	Hon. David Plunket,	Killary Harbour, county Mayo,	288	0	0
15th November,	J. K. Boswell, esq.	Ballyconnelly Bay, county Galway,	233	0	0
1855, 18th July,	John Richards, esq.	Blacksod Bay, county Mayo,	90	0	0
1856, 30th July,	Lord Charles P. P. Clinton,	Bear Haven, county Cork,	45	0	0
21st August,	William Foreman, esq.	Ardbear Bay, county Galway,	90	2	0
1857, 7th August,	Thomas Eccles, esq.	Glengariffe Harbour, county Cork,	9	1	0
1858, 15th February,	Rev. A. Magee,	Streamstown and Cleggan Bays, co. Galway,	277	0	0
15th February,	A. C. Lambert, esq.	Killary Harbour, county Galway,	114	0	0
1860, 3rd February,	Rev. R. H. Wall,	Mannin and Ardbear Bays, county Galway,	348	0	0
3rd February,	Knight of Kerry,	Valencia Harbour, county Kerry,	78	0	0
3rd February,	Captain W. Houston,	Killary Harbour, county Mayo,	43	0	0
13th February,	William M'Cormick, esq.	Achill Sound, county Mayo,	149	0	0
11th May,	Edward Browne, esq.	Ballinakill Harbour, county Galway,	223	0	0
4th October,	M. C. Cramer, esq.	Oyster Haven, county Cork,	20	0	0
9th October,	Ebenezer Pike, esq.	Lough Mahon, Estuary of Lee, county Cork,	47	0	0
14th November,	William Pike, esq.	Achill Sound, county Mayo,	1,676	0	0
1861, 10th January,	William Forbes, esq.	Meenwish Bay, county Galway,	225	0	0
1862, 14th February,	Robert W. C. Reeves, esq.	Clonderlaw Bay, county Clare,	112	0	0
3rd March,	James Walker, esq.	Belfast Lough, Carrickfergus,	57	0	0
6th March,	Edmund Power, esq.	Tramore Bay, county Waterford,	270	0	0
1863, 29th May,	George Clive, esq., M.P.	Achill Sound, county Mayo,	489	0	0
1864, 2nd February,	Lord Fortescue,	Tramore Bay, county Waterford,	83	0	0
5th April,	Lord Wallscourt,	Galway Bay, county Galway,	1,770	0	0
10th June,	Colonel C. M. Vandeleur, M.P.	Poulnasherry Bay, county Clare,	190	0	0
10th June,	A. W. Wyndham, esq.	Newport Bay, county Mayo,	80	0	0
30th September,	Captain George Austin,	Westport Bay, county Mayo,	194	0	0
31st October,	John Kendall, esq.	Ardbear and Mannin Bays, county Galway,	236	0	0
31st October,	Robert T. Atkins, esq.	Lough Hyne, county Cork,	25	0	0
31st October,	P. M. Lynch, esq.	Galway Bay, county Galway,	320	0	0
11th November,	A. Boate, esq.	Dungarvan Harbour, county Waterford,	65	0	0
11th November,	J. R. Dower, esq.	Dungarvan Harbour, county Waterford,	27	0	0
31st December,	Captain W. F. Barry,	Glandore Harbour, county Cork,	68	0	0
31st December,	C. P. Archer, esq.	Ballinakill Harbour, county Galway,	48	0	0
31st December,	P. Macauley, esq.	Ballinakill and Barnaderg Bays, co. Galway,	150	0	0
31st December,	Colonel F. A. K. Gore,	Killala Bay, county Mayo,	375	0	0
1865, 13th April,	Marquess of Sligo,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	190	0	0
13th April,	Sir Robert Gore Booth,	Drumcliff Bay, county Sligo,	148	3	0
12th May,	Lord Baron Ventry,	Dingle Harbour, county Kerry,	130	0	0
2nd November,	Law Life Assurance Society,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	118	0	0
2nd November,	Marquess of Sligo,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	25	0	0
1st December,	Most Rev. Dr. M'Hale,	Shores of Achill Island, county Mayo,	125	0	0
1st December,	Thomas M'Carthy Collins, esq.	Roaringwater Bay, county Cork,	75	0	0
1st December,	Marquess of Sligo,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	26	0	0
1st December,	John Obins Woodhouse, esq.	Carlingford Lough, county Louth,	54	0	0
1st December,	Richard J. Verschoyle, esq.	Ballisodare Bay, county Sligo,	54	0	0
1st December,	Richard Mahony, esq.	Kenmare Estuary, county Kerry,	30	0	0
1866, 20th April,	William Dargan, esq.	Wexford Harbour,	70	0	0
20th April,	Marquess of Sligo,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	270	0	0
21st April,	Miss Anne Fowler,	Blacksod Bay, county Mayo,	11	0	0
4th June,	John Obins Woodhouse, esq.	Carlingford Lough, county Louth,	42	0	0
1867, 15th June,	Sir Robert Gore Booth, bart.	Drumcliff Bay, county Sligo,	87	0	0
10th July,	Horatio H. Townsend, esq.	Skull Harbour, county Cork,	230	0	0
10th July,	Thomas Sandes, esq.	River Shannon, county Kerry,	780	0	0

APPENDIX, No. 22.

APPENDIX, No. 22—*continued.*

LIST of LICENCES GRANTED to Plant OYSTER BEDS up to 31st December, 1875.

Date of Licence.	Persons to whom Granted.	Locality of Beds.	Area of Beds. A.	R.	P.
1867, 10th July,	Mrs. Elizabeth Atkinson,	Blacksod Bay, county Kerry,	100	0	0
10th July,	M. J. C. Longfield, esq.	Roaringwater Bay, county Cork,	310	0	0
10th July,	Thomas Kirkwood, esq.	Saleen Harbour, county Mayo,	17	0	0
10th July,	Richard D. Kane, esq.	Howth Strand, county Dublin,	36	0	0
10th July,	Mrs. Elizabeth Bury,	Lough Mahon, county Cork,	70	0	0
10th July,	Rev. Nicholas Martin,	Trawbreaga Bay, county Donegal,	90	0	0
15th July,	John Smyth, esq.	Midleton River, county Cork,	10	2	0
15th July,	Stephen E. Collis, esq.	River Shannon, county Kerry,	212	0	0
15th July,	Thomas Hicks, esq.	Roaringwater Bay, county Cork,	45	0	0
16th July,	Robert W. C. Reeves, esq.	River Shannon, county Clare,	30	0	0
24th July,	Francis J. Graham, esq.	Barnaderg Bay, county Galway,	90	0	0
1868, 31st January,	William Hart, esq.	Lough Swilly, county Donegal,	790	0	0
11th February,	Richard Lyons, esq.	Midleton River, county Cork,	15	0	0
11th February,	Charles Sandes, esq.	River Shannon, county Kerry,	56	0	0
13th March,	Stephen Browne, esq.	Dunmanus Bay, county Cork,	9	0	0
13th March,	Colonel Edward Cooper,	Ballisodare Bay, county Sligo,	190	0	0
1869, 13th February,	Henry Herbert,	Kenmare Bay,	20	0	0
13th February,	Earl of Bantry,	Adrigole Harbour,	18	0	0
13th February,	Earl of Bantry,	Glengariffe Harbour,	60	0	0
4th March,	John P. Nolan,	Ard Bay,	290	0	0
11th March,	Richard J. Mahony,	Kenmare Bay,	46	0	0
11th March,	Thomas Kingston Sullivan,	Kenmare Bay,	195	0	0
15th March,	John W. Payne,	Bantry Bay,	51	0	0
14th June,	John W. Stratford,	Killala Bay,	31	0	0
14th June,	Mrs. Catherine Browne,	Courtmacsherry Bay,	60	0	0
14th June,	William Little,	Killala Bay,	190	0	0
10th September,	Lord Clermont,	Carlingford Lough,	46	0	0
10th September,	Henry W. Meredith,	Sligo Bay,	20	0	0
10th September,	Owen Wynne,	Sligo Bay,	77	0	0
10th September,	Owen Wynne,	Sligo Bay,	53	0	0
1870, 12th March,	R. J. Verschoyle,	Ballisodare Bay,	13	2	0
1871, 22nd March,	Earl of Bantry & T. J. Leahy,	Berehaven,	122	0	0
27th March,	Earl of Bantry,	Ardgroom Harbour,	240	0	0
27th March,	Thomas Hicks,	Roaringwater Bay, county Cork,	30	0	0
22nd April,	Agnes M. Nicholson,	Sligo Bay,	52	2	10
24th April,	Ed. Park,	Milk Haven, county Sligo,	22	0	0
24th April,	Martin Cunnawn,	Milk Haven, county Sligo,	2	2	10
24th April,	Michael Cunnawn,	Milk Haven, county Sligo,	2	1	10
1st July,	Arthur Hamill, esq., Q.C.	Carlingford Lough, county Louth,	144	0	0
15th July,	Sir James Stewart, bart.	Lough Swilly, county Donegal,	106	2	21
27th July,	F. Mansfield, esq.	Lough Swilly, county Donegal,	25	1	0
9th October,	Marquis of Downshire,	Dundrum Bay,	32	0	2
26th December,	Major Scott,	Barnaderg Bay,	390	3	0
26th December,	Colin Hugh Thomson,	Killery Bay,	201	2	0
1872, 9th February,	W. and J. St. George,	Galway Bay,	810	0	0
25th May,	W. Pike,	Achill Sound,	308	3	20
21st June,	Lord Bandon,	Dunmanus Bay,	132	3	31½
3rd July,	J. Rowan,	Achill Sound,	43	3	0
14th October,	S. R. Townsend,	Rincolisky Harbour, Roaringwater Bay,	240	3	30
16th December,	W. O. M'Cormick,	Rathfran Bay,	95	1	32
1873, 24th February,	R. J. Verschoyle,	Ballisodare Bay, county Sligo,	114	0	20
3rd March,	Isabella Letitia Eccles,	Milk Haven, county Sligo,	29	1	3
6th March,	Lieut.-Col. Wm. H. Longfield,	Cork Harbour,	22	2	30
6th March,	Thomas Hicks,	Roaringwater Bay, county Cork,	145	0	30
14th June,	Robert M'Cowen,	Barrow Harbour, county Kerry,	84	1	26
1st December,	Benjamin Whitney,	Blacksod Bay, county Mayo,	81	1	17
8th December,	Mary Fegan,	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	26	2	7
31st December,	Gillman Browne,	Ballynakill Bay, county Galway,	73	3	5
1874, 29th January,	Sir Henry W. Beecher, bart.	Lough Hyne, county Cork,	30	1	24
10th April,	Rev. R. Gibbings, D.D.	Kingstown Bay, county Galway,	133	2	34
14th September,	Samuel Murland, esq.,	Strangford Lough, county Down,	15	3	28
15th October,	F. Mansfield, esq.	Lough Swilly, county Donegal,	12	2	0
27th October,	John Kendall, esq.	Dungarvan Bay, county Waterford,	240	2	32
1875, 27th January,	St. Geo. Jones Martin, esq.	Sligo Estuary or Bay, county Sligo,	77	1	33
5th July,	Thomas Shaen Carter, esq.	Trawmore Bay, county Mayo,	502	3	22
15th July,	Daniel Conway,	Bellacragher Bay, county Mayo,	2	0	34
16th August,	John Kendall, esq.	Clew Bay, county Mayo,	44	0	37
		Total,	18,533	2	2½

Oyster Fisheries—Queries No. 1.

Appendix No. 23.—Abstract of Replies to Queries received from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 1—5th November, 1846. Tramore Bay, County Mayo. Granted to W. H. Carter.	Licence No. 2—7th December, 1846. Saleem Harbour, County Mayo. Granted to Luke Lyons.	Licence No. 16—7th August, 1857. Glengariffe Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Thomas Eccles. Present owner—Kate E. Courtis.
7. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed? 8. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed? 9. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your first operations? 6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity? 12. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 13. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 14. Was the spatting this year good? 10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success? 11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Merged into licence No. 136.	This is the same bed as that for which a licence was granted to John Townsend Kirkwood,—Luke Lyons being only agent.—See No. 71, Queries 3.	I beg to inform you that I, in April last, sold the hotel, &c., at Glengarriffe; but in consequence of the fore-shore on which the oysters lay being owned by Lord Bantry, I relinquished my right to it. Of course every fish has been taken off the bed; but I am sure Lord Bantry intends adding it to his own, as he, last year, spent some money on the latter, and spoke of adding to them. Fredk. T. Courtis.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 20—3rd February, 1860. Valentia Harbour, County Kerry. Granted to Knight of Kerry.	Licence No. 27—10th January, 1861. Meenwish Bay, County Galway. Granted to William Forbes.	Licence No. 29—3rd March, 1862. Belfast Lough, Carrickfergus, Co. Antrim. Granted to James Walker.
7. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed? 8. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed? 9. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your first operations? 6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity? 12. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 13. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 14. Was the spatting this year good? 10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success? 11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Abandoned.	Abandoned.	We beg to inform you that Mr. James Walker is at present in Natal, South Africa, and we are without information on the subject of your Queries relative to the oyster licence granted him as above, W. Hartley & Co.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 35—10th June, 1864. Newport Bay, County Mayo. Granted to A. W. Wyndham.	Licence No. 39—31st October, 1864. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to R. E. L. Athy.	Licence No. 42—11th November, 1864. Dungarvan Harbour, County Waterford. Granted to J. R. Dower.
7. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed? 8. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed? 9. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your first operations? 6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity? 12. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 13. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 14. Was the spatting this year good? 10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success? 11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Abandoned.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence revoked.	Abandoned.

Appendix No. 23.—Abstract of Replies to Queries receiv

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 48—13th April, 1865. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to the Most Hon. Marquess of Sligo. Lessee—Lord John Browne.	Licence No. 50—29th April, 1865. Sligo Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Rt. Hon. John Wynne.	Licence No. 52—2nd November, 1865. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Law Life Association.
1. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed? 2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed? 3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your first operations? 6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity? 7. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 8. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 9. Was the spatting this year good? 10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success? 11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Abandoned.	New licence issued.—See No. 99, Queries 3.	Abandoned.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 63—20th April, 1866. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Most Hon. the Marquess of Sligo. Lessee—Lord John Browne.	Licence No. 73—10th July, 1867. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to William and J. St. George.	Licence No. 76—10th July, 1867. Trawbreaga Bay, County Donegal. Granted to Rev. Nicholas Martin.
1. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed? 2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed? 3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your first operations? 6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity? 7. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 8. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 9. Was the spatting this year good? 10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success? 11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Abandoned.	Licence revoked by order, dated 26th January, 1872.	Abandoned.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 129—29th January, 1874. Lough Hyne. Granted to Sir H. W. Beecher, bart.	Licence No. 131—14th September, 1874. Granted to Samuel Murland.	Licence No. 132—15th July, 1875. Granted to Daniel Conway.
1. At what time after the above date were steps taken to cultivate the bed?	1. About September, 1874.	No replies received.	1. October, 1875.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you then to cultivate the bed?	2. Clearing it of weeds and rubbish.		2. I employed men and cleared aw large stones on a portion of it.
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?	3. 60,400—viz., 21,600 two years old, 38,800 one year old.		3. About 100,000 large and small; b sold all the full-grown ones, exce a very little—viz., 10,000—which will sell next week.
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?	4. No.		4. A few sticks of heath, also middl sized stones.
5. What was the result of your first operations?	5. There has not as yet been time to tell.		5. Could not say until next spattin season, as I had not much tim last season after licence had be granted.
6. Have you ever collected spat on your bed; and if so, when and in what quantity?	6. No.		6. Not much, as I had not many oyste there until last dredging seaso but I placed some natural spat the and collected it in small quantitie
7. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?	7. One caretaker all the year round.		7. On low water, from 1st October 1st April, two others and mysel during close-season only myself.
8. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?	8. 60,400.		8. From 10,000 to 15,000.
9. Was the spatting this year good?	9. —		9. Not as good as either of the last tw years.
10. If your undertaking has not proved satisfactory, to what cause do you attribute its non-success?	10. —		10. For the want of means—mone &c.—to carry out my business my satisfaction.
11. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	11. The oysters were laid down in December, 1875, and were obtained from Arcachon, and as yet we can't say much as to the chance of success or not.		11. I expected to get £50 of the Fishe loan this year, but there were t many applicants, therefore I cou not compete with other buyers wh were able to give large prices.

FISHERIES.

rom Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

Licence No. 55—1st December, 1865. Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to Thomas M'Carthy Collins.	Licence No. 56—1st December, 1865. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to the Most Hon. Marquess of Sligo. Lessee—Lord John Browne.	Licence No. 57—1st December, 1865. Carlingford Lough, County Louth. Granted to John Obins Woodhouse.	Licence No. 62—20th April, 1866. Wexford Harbour. Granted to William Dargan.
No replies received.	Abandoned.	This bed is included in that granted by licence of 4th June, 1866.—See No. 65, Queries No. 2.	Abandoned.

Licence No. 90—4th March, 1869. Ard Bay, County Galway. Granted to Captain John P. Nolan.	Licence No. 126—1st December, 1873. Blacksod Bay. Granted to B. Whitney.	Licence No. 128—31st December, 1873. Ballynakill Bay. Granted to Gillman Browne.
No replies received.	No replies received.	1. April, 1875. 2. Cleaning banks and removing oysters from the deep, and placing them on new bed. I bought 1,000 oysters and put them down in 1875. 3. 5,000 French oysters, 2½-inch; 1,000 native oysters, 3-inch. About 6,000 large oysters dredged in deep water and put down on bank where there were no oysters previously. 4. Clean cullets and stones—the latter on the highest portion of the bed. 5. Scarcely any spat last summer—found a little attached to a piece of lime-stone; the stone was put down as mooring for a buoy. 6. Nothing worth mentioning; intend to try some additional collectors. 7. I had six men employed in two boats dredging oysters out of deep channel and putting them down on new bed. Occasionally cleansing. They were employed during March and April, whenever their agricultural pursuits would permit. 8. Cannot at present calculate the quantity of oysters; after a little more experience I may be able to do so. 9. No. 10. It is too soon to pronounce an opinion as to the result of my oyster culti-vation. I think oysters will, in favourable seasons, breed on my beds; but I doubt if they will fatten. 11. I have put down oysters on other beds not referred to on this paper. The French oysters are doing well so far.

Licence No. 133—15th October, 1874. Granted to Francis Mansfield.	Licence No. 134—27th October, 1874. Granted to John Kendal.	Licence No. 135—27th January, 1875. Granted to St. George Jones Martin. Lessee—Mr. Gardiner.	Licence No. 136.—5th July, 1875. Granted to Thomas Shaen Carter.
1. Immediately after above date numbers of oysters were planted on the outside bed, and soon after-wards many were removed to the inner bed. 2. The oysters, when planted on the outer bed, were removed to the new—both beds being, in point of fact, one bed, and not separated from one another. 3. Since above date there have been planted 14,700 oysters of various sizes—some full-grown, some small—which have been distributed over all parts of the beds. 4. None were used. 5. — 6. No spat has been collected, except such as may have been deposited on the bed or bought with seed oysters. 7. From eight to twelve men. At various seasons during spring tides. Some are employed remov-ing vermin, and others have been making an enclosure of timber round the bed to prevent the oysters getting off, and others are employed in keeping this fence free of seaweed, mud, &c., and in keeping the oysters free from weeds growing to them, &c., &c. 8. The number of oysters at present on the bed is, as near as we can calculate, 435,600, exclusive of last year's spat, which was much greater than that of 1874. 9. Pretty good. 10. It cannot as yet be said that the undertaking has been unsuccessful; but the chief cause of non-success would be the difficulty of preventing the oysters from moving off the bed, and also the difficulty of obtaining seed oysters, owing to excessive exportation. 11. —	1. Immediately. 2. To clean the ground. 3. A good proportion of the 1,000,000 oysters stated in reply to question 2, licence 41. Sizes various. 4. Cockle and mussel shells. 5. The sand shifted more than we anti-cipated, and caused failure. 6. No. 7. Two constantly; and sometimes at spring tides from twenty to forty. 8. On this bed and No. 41 (which are worked together) rather more than 1,000,000, but they have all been purchased. 9 and 10. We observed many oysters full of spat, but we see no results. The sand shifts too much and the cur-rents are too strong. 11. —	No replies received.	No replies received.

APPENDIX No. 23.—ABSTRACT of Replies to Queries received

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 6—5th February, 1851. Estuary of Kenmare River, County Kerry. Granted to Rev. Denis Mahony.	LICENCE No. 7—17th November, 1852. Ballisodare Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Thomas White. Present owner—James Chas. Whyte Douglas.	LICENCE No. 11—15th November, 1854. Killary Harbour, County Mayo. Granted to Hon. David Plunket. Present owner—T. A. MacDonnell.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?			
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?			
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?			
5. What was the result of your operations?	Richard J. Mahony, Esq., rep. of Rev. Denis Mahony, is making preparations to plant a large quantity of seed oysters in this bed.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued. Only about 10 acres, out of grant, suitable for cultivation.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?			
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			
8. Was the spatting this year good?			
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 19—3rd February, 1860. Mannin and Ardbear Bays, County Galway. Granted to Rev. R. H. Wall. Present owner—Walter S. Wall.	LICENCE No. 21—3rd February, 1860. Killary Harbour, County Mayo. Granted to Captain W. Houstoun. Present Owner—William Barber.	LICENCE No. 22—13th February, 1860. Achill Sound, County Mayo. Granted to William M'Cormick. Present owner—Charles Spencer S. Dickins.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?			1. Cleaning.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?			2. To plant with large and brood oysters and shells.
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			3. About 9,600 oysters. One-fourth large, fully grown; the remainder brood and sprat.
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?			4. Shells.
5. What was the result of your operations?	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	5. Very good.
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?			6. Four. In April. Cleaning the bed of weeds.
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			7. About 20,000.
8. Was the spatting this year good?			8. Pretty good.
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			9. Oyster beds properly stocked and attended to can yield at least double the quantity in each season.

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 32—2nd February, 1864. Tramore Bay, County Waterford. Granted to Earl Fortescue.	LICENCE No. 33—5th April, 1864. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to Lord Wallscourt.	LICENCE No. 37—31st October, 1864. Ardbear and Mannin Bays, County Galway. Granted to John Kendall.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?			
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?	Owing to the difficulty of procuring brood oysters no attention to the oyster bed has taken place during the past year. But about a twelvemonth since, having received an offer from a breeder of oysters near Tralee, I ordered a certain quantity to be sent here by way of experiment, and ordered one of the disused oyster parks to be repaired for the purpose of receiving them; but owing to the bad management of the railways, there are considerable difficulties in the way of transporting such perishable commodities as oysters—serious delays were interposed, and finally the oysters were never sent.		
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?		Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued. There are only from 80 to 100 acres of the grant in this case, out of 1,770 acres, suitable for cultivating.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.
5. What was the result of your operations?			
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?			
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			
8. Was the spatting this year good?			
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			

FISHERIES.

from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

No. 2.

LICENCE No. 12—15th November, 1854. Ballyconnelly Bay, County Galway. Granted to J. K. Boswell. Lessee—William Young.	LICENCE No. 15—21st August, 1856. Ardbear Bay, County Galway. Granted to William Foreman. Lessee—John Kendall.	LICENCE No. 17—15th February, 1858. Streamstown and Cleggan Bays, Co. Galway. Granted to Rev. Anthony Magee, D.D.	LICENCE No. 18—15th February, 1858. Killary Harbour, County Galway. Granted to A. C. Lambert.
Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Revocation under consideration.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.
LICENCE No. 23—11th May, 1860. Ballynakill Harbour, County Galway. Granted to Edward Browne. Present Owner—Gillman Browne.	LICENCE No. 24—4th October, 1860. Oyster Haven, County Cork. Granted to M. C. Cramer.	LICENCE No. 25—9th October, 1860. Lough Mahon, Estuary of Lee, Co. Cork. Granted to Ebenezer Pike.	LICENCE No. 28—14th February, 1862. Clonderlaw Bay, County Clare. Granted to Robert W. C. Reeves.
Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	No replies received.	The channel of the river still altering, in consequence of the railway bridge; and the difficulty of protecting the oysters from being stolen prevents my going to expense in laying down a quantity of oysters.	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.
LICENCE No. 40—31st October, 1864. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to P. M. Lynch. Present Owner—Major J. W. Lynch.	LICENCE No. 43—31st December, 1864. Glandore Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Captain W. F. Barry.	LICENCE No. 44—31st December, 1864. Ballynakill Harbour, County Galway. Granted to C. P. Archer. Present Owner—Thomas Russell.	LICENCE No. 45—31st December, 1864. Ballynakill Harbour, County Galway. Granted to T. Young Prior.
Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	No replies received.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence revoked.

APPENDIX No. 23.—ABSTRACT of Replies to Queries received

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 46—31st December, 1864. Ballynakill and Barnaderg Bays, Co. Galway. Granted to P. Macauly. Present Owner—Mitchell Henry, M.P.	LICENCE No. 49—13th April, 1865. Drumcliffe Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Sir Robert Gore Booth, Bart.	LICENCE No. 51—12th May, 1865. Dingle Harbour, County Kerry. Granted to Lord Baron Ventry.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	No steps have been taken since last report.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?			
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?			
5. What was the result of your operations?			
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?			
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			
8. Was the spatting this year good?			
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 68—10th July, 1867. River Shannon, County Kerry. Granted to Thomas Sandes.	LICENCE No. 70—10th July, 1867. Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to M. J. C. Longfield.	LICENCE No. 74—10th July, 1867. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to Christopher T. Redington.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?	Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.	None. The person who proposed to become tenant for the bed declined to carry out his agreement, and I did not consider it advisable to enforce it by a lawsuit. SAMPSON T. A. FRENCH.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence revoked.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?			
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?			
5. What was the result of your operations?			
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and what work?			
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			
8. Was the spatting this year good?			
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 86—13th March, 1868. Ballysodare Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Colonel Edward Cooper.	LICENCE No. 87—13th February, 1869. Kenmare Bay, County Kerry. Granted to Henry Herbert.	LICENCE No. 93—15th March, 1869. Bantry Bay, County Cork. Granted to John W. Payne.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	No replies received.	No replies received.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?			
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?			
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?			
5. What was the result of your operations?			
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?			
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?			
8. Was the spatting this year good?			
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.			

FISHERIES.

from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

LICENCE No. 58—1st December, 1865. Ballinakill Harbour, County Galway. Granted to Captain Acheson.	LICENCE No. 61—1st December, 1865. Killary Harbour, County Galway. Granted to Robert M'Keown.	LICENCE No. 66—15th June, 1867. Drumcliffe Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Sir Robert Gore Booth, Bart. Lessee—Owen Rice.	LICENCE No. 67—10th July, 1867. Skull Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Horatio Hamilton Townsend.
Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence revoked.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence revoked.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	No replies received.
LICENCE No. 78—15th July, 1867. River Shannon, County Kerry. Granted to Stephen R. Collis.	LICENCE No. 80—16th July, 1867. River Shannon, County Clare. Granted to Robert W. C. Reeves.	LICENCE No. 81—24th July, 1867. Barnaderg Bay, County Galway. Granted to Francis J. Graham.	LICENCE No. 84—11th February, 1868. River Shannon, County Kerry. Granted to Charles Sandes.
Inquiry held by Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.
LICENCE No. 95—14th June, 1869. Courtmacsherry Bay, County Cork. Granted to Mrs. Catherine Bourne.	LICENCE No. 96—14th June, 1869. Killala Bay, County Mayo. Granted to William Little.	LICENCE No. 98—10th September, 1869. Sligo Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Henry W. Meredith.	LICENCE No. 99—10th September, 1869. Sligo Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Owen Wynne.
No replies received.	No replies received.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued. There are only about 3 acres out of the grant suitable for cultivation.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.

APPENDIX No. 23.—ABSTRACT of Replies to Queries received

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 100—10th September, 1869. Sligo Bay, County Sligo. Granted to Owen Wynne.	LICENCE No. 102—22nd April, 1871. Cullenamore Strand, County Sligo. Granted to Miss Agnes Mary Nicholson.	LICENCE No. 106—24th April, 1871. Off the lands of Moneygold, County Sligo. Granted to Edward Parke.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed? 2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed? 3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters? 4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description? 5. What was the result of your operations? 6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work? 7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate? 8. Was the spatting this year good? 9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued. There is only a small portion of ground in this case suitable for cultivation.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued. There are only about 2 acres of the ground licensed suitable for cultivation.

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 115—9th February, 1872. Galway Bay, County Galway. Granted to Wm. and J. St. George.	LICENCE No. 116—25th May, 1872. Achill Sound, County Mayo. Granted to William Pike.	LICENCE No. 117—21st June, 1872. Dunmanus Bay, County Cork. Granted to Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bandon.
1. What steps have been taken since last Report to cultivate the bed?	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	1. Strictly preserved and distributed the oysters on it.	Operations were interrupted by quantities of sea-wool and other weeds which destroyed the oysters. A new bed is, however, now making, and the first supply has been put down of young oysters, and the work will go on. There is great *difficulty* and great *expense* in procuring oysters, and they have to be brought from a long distance. H. B. BERNARD.
2. What was the nature of the steps taken by you to cultivate the bed?		2. By laying oysters on it and procuring seed.	
3. What quantity of oysters were put down by you, and were they small or full-grown oysters?		3. I cannot estimate as they were removed from one part of the bed to another. All sizes.	
4. Were any collectors used for catching spat; and if so, of what description?		4. No; except that empty shells were placed on the bed where it was sandy.	
5. What was the result of your operations?		5. The oysters are breeding now.	
6. How many people are employed on your bed? At what season are they so employed, and at what work?		6. Two occasionally, when we can procure spat to lay down.	
7. What is the stock of oysters and oyster spat at present on your bed, as near as you can calculate?		7. I have not dredged this portion. There is a fair quantity of seed on the parts adapted for oyster culture.	
8. Was the spatting this year good?		8. Very good.	
9. Any general observations or statements you wish to make.		9. I consider that it is most difficult as the law now stands to protect private beds. I should suggest that the coast-guard should be required to be more vigilant.	

QUERIES

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 3—9th June, 1848. Off Daurus Point, County Kerry. Granted to F. H. Dowling. Present owner—Marquess of Lansdowne.	LICENCE No. 4—24th February, 1849. Dunmanus Bay, County Cork. Granted to R. T. Evanson. Present owner—M. H. Morris.	LICENCE No. 5—5th February, 1851. Estuary of Kenmare River, County Kerry. Granted to John Mahony. Present owner—Colonel Trevor Goff.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	No replies received.	1. Sold none; but had a few thousand for home consumption.	1. None.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?		2. Cannot estimate. Cannot dredge outside low-water. Bed stoney, and usually covered with weedy deposit.	2. I am unable to form any estimate of the quantity.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.		3. No spat that I could see.	3. I believe there was some spat deposited on the portions of the bed which are always covered with water this year, and more than for some years previous.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?		4. For fattening.	4. For fattening, so far as I can judge.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?		5. In production. Deposit of wool and growth of seaweed.	5. It has not proved successful hitherto, and I attribute the failure to the bed having been pillaged, and also having been left too bare of oysters by a former tenant of it.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.		6. Proprietors who cannot afford to lay out capital should be enabled to borrow from Fishery fund.	6. —

FISHERIES.

from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

Licence No. 107—24th April, 1871. Off the lands of Moneygold, County Sligo. Granted to Martin Cunnawn.	Licence No. 108—24th April, 1871. Off the Lands of Moneygold, County Sligo. Granted to Michael Cunnawn.	Licence No. 111—1st July, 1871. Carlingford Lough, County Louth. Granted to Arthur Hamill, Q.C.	Licence No. 114—26th December, 1871. Killary Bay, Little, County Galway. Granted to Colin Hugh Thomson.
Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.	Last season I was not able to lay any oyster spat for the reasons mentioned in my letter to you of last year, nor can I well do so until the final completion of the railway being constructed along the Mullatee fore-shore, and consequent dispersion of the men, with their families, working at it. In the course of the past summer I went myself over the shore where I had previously laid oysters; and whether from the causes before indicated, or the great scour of the sea, I found scarcely a dozen of oysters—all of them small. I made an effort on that occasion to procure spat from other parts of the lough (as I was informed the flavour of an oyster produced from spat brought from any other place was easily detected and the oyster rejected), but I could not obtain any. I have been promised spat (Carlingfords) in the course of the coming season, when I hope to be able (partially at least) to stock my bed. ARTHUR HAMILL.	Inquiry held by the Inspectors as to proper cultivation of bed. Licence to be continued.

Licence No. 119—14th October, 1872. Rincolisky Harbour, Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to S. R. Townsend.	Licence No. 120—16th December, 1872. Rathfran Bay, County Mayo. Granted to William O. M'Cormick.	Licence No. 127.—8th December, 1873. Clew Bay. Granted to Mary Fegan, a Minor.	Licence No. 130—10th April, 1874. Kingstown Bay, County Galway. Granted to Rev. R. Gibbings, D.D.
1. The bed, which was hitherto imperfectly marked, has been carefully buoyed.	1. Abandoned.		1. Nothing particular has been done since oysters were put down in October, 1874.
2. No seed oysters could be obtained last season; but they have been ordered, and are daily expected from Arcachon, France.	2. Do.		2. The place does not require very much cultivation; but a man is employed to prevent mischief.
3. —	3. Do.		3. About 6,000 small oysters were paid for; but I believe that some were stolen.
4. —	4. —		4. No.
5. —	5. —	No replies received.	5. —
6. —	6. —		6. —
7. —	7. —		7. —
8. —	8. —		8. —
9. From the impossibility of obtaining seed no progress was made. Seed oysters have been ordered from France for upwards of two months and are daily expected to reach Cork.	9. Found it impossible to procure oysters to stock the ground, or a suitable person to oversee the farming of same.		9. —

No. 3.

Licence No. 8—17th November, 1852. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to John C. Garvey. Lessee—Captain George Austin.	Licence No. 9—22nd September, 1853. Mulroy Bay, County Donegal. Granted to John O. Woodhouse. Present owner—C. O. Woodhouse.	Licence No. 10—1st July, 1854. Carlingford Lough, County Louth. Granted to Burton Bindon. Present owner—Lord Clermont.	Licence No. 13—18th July, 1855. Blacksod Bay, County Mayo. Granted to John Richards.
1. About 400 barrels each, containing about 1,100 sizable oysters, at 60*s.* per barrel.	1. None sold this year.		1. 3,000, at 6*s.* per 100.
2. About 2,000 buds of all sizes.	2. At present about 16,000.		2. About 20,000.
3. None.	3. The quantity of spat deposited was fair, but not above the average.		3. Not much spat, but greater than 1874.
4. Neither; only fit for laying down brood, to be cultivated by dredging, &c., for two or three years, until large enough for market, when it is sent to our beds in England to be fattened.	4. The greater part of the bed is rather adapted for breeding than fattening.	For answers, see those given to No. 97—the two oyster beds being too much connected to permit of separate statements.	4. Fattening.
5. It has proved very slightly successful, as the price of oysters in Clew bay has been so high we cannot purchase sufficient stock for the bed, the small brood having been taken out of the bay.	5. Hitherto some difficulty has been found in protecting the oysters from being destroyed by sand and mud carried over the beds by the current of the tide, which at the part of the bay where the beds are situated is very strong.		5. Unsuccessful, as there is too much shifting sand.
6. We have been obliged to import oysters from France to keep our bed stocked, and try to get a spat from them, which they breed from to a very large extent.	6. —		6. None.

APPENDIX No. 23.—ABSTRACT of Replies to Queries received

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 14—30th July, 1856. Bear Haven, County Cork. Granted to Lord C. P. P. Clinton.	LICENCE No. 26—14th November, 1860. Achill Sound, County Mayo. Granted to William Pike.	LICENCE No. 30—6th March, 1862. Tramore Bay, County Waterford. Granted to Edmund Power.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	1. None.	1. None sold.	1. I sold none during the last year; I have, however, used some of them myself.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. I cannot form an estimate of the quantity, but I believe it is on the increase.	2. The quantity on the beds is still disproportionate to the extent of them, from the cause assigned in No. 5 query.	2. I estimate the quantity of all sizes now on my bed to be about 6,000 or 7,000.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. The quantity of spat not large, but yet more than in 1874.	3. Yes, a great deal. Better than last year.	3. There was no deposit of spat in either the years 1874 or 1875.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. I am not sufficiently versed in the culture of oysters to answer this question.	4. Breeding chiefly. The oysters it produces are of excellent quality and fat also.	4. For fattening.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. I believe the undertaking was not successful.	5. It was very successful, but was over dredged by parties to whom I let it. It is now improving rapidly, and the oysters are of good quality.	5. My undertaking has been, I regret to say, unsuccessful in production, although, as stated in my former reports, I went to considerable expense and trouble. No doubt the cause of non-success is the great influx of mud and sand and great strength of the tides.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make?	6. I had the bed carefully looked after lately—mussels, star-fish, and weeds removed; and I intend to get some breeding oysters put on the bed, which I hope will be a success.	6. I should suggest that stealing oysters should be dealt with at Petty Sessions instead of Quarter Sessions; and that orders should be given to the Coast-guards to pay more attention than they now do to the proceedings of the dredgers on public beds; as in this district both large and small oysters have been removed, and the public beds are nearly useless from that cause.	6. I have no suggestion or statement to to make.

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 41—11th November, 1864. Dungarvan Harbour, County Waterford. Granted to A. Boate. Present owner—John Kendall.	LICENCE No. 47—31st December, 1864. Killala Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Col. Sir F. A. Knox Gore, Bart.	LICENCE No. 58—2nd November, 1865. Clew Bay, County Mayo. Granted to the Most Hon. Marquess of Sligo. Lessees—J. G. Baxter & Son.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	1. 12,000, at 10*s.* per 100.	1. None sold. A number dredged for private use. Finding a very great difficulty in obtaining seed I am unwilling to weaken the bed.	1. None sold.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. 1,000,000; all purchased.	2. I am unable to say with any degree of accuracy, as the best part of my beds are in deep water. Probably under 80,000 saleable oysters, and *scarcely* double the number of brood, for the cause noted in reply to query 4.	2. Only a few hundreds.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. None.	3. It appeared to be a favourable season for spatting—better than the foregoing.	3. None deposited.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. We thought fattening; but this year the oysters have not fattened, and we are about to remove them, or most of them, in consequence.	4. Very answerable for growing and fattening; not so for breeding, as the places where oysters seem to do best are subject to a heavy tide, by which a large proportion of spat is washed away before it adheres to material at the bottom.	4. Merely a depository.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. The shifting sand prevents the bed being profitable for production; and probably an excess of fresh water in the only part suitable for laying is the cause of the oysters failing to fatten.	5. Would have proved in all respects a success but for the cause stated in (4). Also a large portion of the area allotted does not suit equally well; and is in places ever fatal to all shell fish. Furthermore, the extreme difficulty and inordinate cost of brood oysters is a great drawback to a bed which does not breed well.	5. By purchasing oysters at a higher price than we could sell for.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.	6. —	6. —	6. We have discontinued to purchase oysters in Clew bay.

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 65—4th June, 1866. Carlingford Lough, County Louth. Granted to J. O. Woodhouse. Present owner—C. O. Woodhouse.	LICENCE No. 69—10th July, 1867. Blacksod Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Mrs. Elizabeth Atkinson. Lessee—Capt. M. W. Davies. Sub-Lessee—James Gallagher.	LICENCE No. 71—10th July, 1867. Saleen Harbour, County Mayo. Granted to John Townsend Kirkwood. Lessee—James Gallagher.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel. If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained?	1. None.	1. None.	1. None sold this year.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. Under 10,000.	2. To the best of my opinion there is but very little.	2. I think about twenty-five or thirty barrels.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. Not more than usual.	3. I think the spatting is about the same as in 1874.	3. There was not much spat on this bed this season.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. Better for fattening.	4. For breeding.	4. For breeding.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. Flax-water, the great obstacle to success.	5. To over dredging by the public, as they consider where this bed is public rights. The gentleman I got this bed from has left the country, I believe. Though I paid him a sum of money for this bed I never gained anything by it; as I am annoyed by the dredging men, this bed being on the navigable channel, and they consider it their own rights.	5. To over dredging on the public grounds.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make?	6. —	6. About this bed I can say no more at present.	6. I am quite sure this bay is destroyed by over dredging.

FISHERIES.

from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

Licence No. 31—29th May, 1863. Achill Sound, County Mayo. Granted to George Clive, M.P.	Licence No. 34—10th June, 1864. Portnasherry Bay, County Clare. Granted to Colonel C. M. Vandeleur, M.P.	Licence No. 36—30th September, 1864. Westport Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Captain George Austin.	Licence No. 38—31st October, 1864. Lough Hyne, County Cork. Granted to R. T. Atkins.
1. None.	1. Sold from 1st January to 31st December, 1875, 18,000 oysters, at 9*s.* per hundred.	1. About 400 barrels, each containing about 1,100 sizable oysters, at 60*s.* per barrel.	
2. Very few.	2. 160,000 of all sizes; 90,000 fit for market.	2. About 2,000 buds of all sizes.	
3. Very little; it's mostly carried off by the current.	3. There was a great increase of spat since 1874.	3. None.	
4. Breeding.	4. It is best adapted for growing and fattening,	4. Neither; only fit for laying down brood, to be cultivated by dredging, &c., for two or three years, till large enough for markets, when it is sent to our beds, in England, to be fattened.	
5. Unsuccessful—first, on account of the current, and the bed being small is not worth going to much expense for watching, and I quite believe many are stolen.	5. It has proved successful.	5. It has proved very slightly successful, as the price of oysters in Clew bay has been so high we cannot purchase sufficient stock for the bed, the small brood having been taken out of the bay by other parties, and is carried on now to a large extent, so that we cannot compete with them.	No replies received.
6. I think it very advisable that all dredging on public beds should be stopped for at least two or three years in this bay, so as to let a stock get up.	6. —	6. We have been obliged to import oysters from France to keep our beds stocked and try and get a spat from them, which they breed from to a very large extent in France.	

Licence No. 54—1st December, 1865. Shores off Achill Island, County Mayo. Granted to Most Rev. J. MacHale, D.D.	Licence No. 59—1st December, 1865. Ballysodare Bay, County Sligo. Granted to R. J. Verschoyle.	Licence No. 60—1st December, 1865. Kenmare Estuary, County Kerry. Granted to Richard Mahony.	Licence No. 64—21st April, 1866. Blacksod Bay, County Mayo. Granted to Miss Anne Fowler. Lessee—James Gallagher.
			1. None sold off this bed this season.
			2. I should think on or about twenty barrels.
No replies received.	See replies to Licence No. 121 (Queries No. 3) which equally refer to this bed.	See replies to queries, No. 92. Licence granted to Thomas K. Sullivan.	3. I see by the stones that the spatting is about the same as 1874.
			4. For breeding.
			5. All my non-success I attribute to over dredging outside my bed, as the public grounds is over-dredged.
			6. I should think it would be a very good thing to do to put a stop to dredging on the public grounds for a few years, as I think the public grounds are destroyed by being over-dredged.

Licence No. 72—10th July, 1867. Howth Strand, County Dublin. Granted to Richard D. Kane.	Licence No. 75—10th July, 1867. Lough Mahon, County Cork. Granted to Mrs. Elizabeth Bury.	Licence No. 77—15th July, 1867. Midleton River, County Cork. Granted to John Smyth.	Licence No. 79—16th July, 1867. Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to Thomas Hicks.
1. I sold none.		1. Fifteen thousand four hundred and three-quarters. Price, £5 per thousand, long count—*i.e.*, 126 to each hundred.	1. None.
2. About 7,000 or 8,000; but it's only conjecture, as the weather does not permit of close inspection.		2. About eighty thousand, if so many.	2. As they are in deep water I have no means of judging.
3. I cannot discover any; but some may have been.		3. Some spat settles on the bank every year, but in inconsiderable quantity.	3. I think, like the preceding year, very little.
4. For fattening.	None: all having been stolen by poachers last season, notwithstanding a watchman being at all times on the spot.	4. Fattening.	4. I laid the oysters down with the view of breeding; and wishing (if possible) to form good beds, I've taken none up at present.
5. I attribute its non-success to the strong currents in the channel and the difficulty of putting down collectors in the ground, which is composed of limestone rock, and sticks or poles cannot be driven into the ground.		5. Reasonably successful. The oyster fattens well on the bed. I have no doubt but it would pay well if the spat could be taken artificially, as in the French beds. I purpose this year, D.V., laying down tiles and flags with that intent.	5. I fear the water is too rough to allow of the deposit of the spat, except in very fine seasons; and the spatting, from some cause or other, has been said to have been defective for some years.
6. Nothing, beyond an improvement in the channel and more protection. I placed a large quantity of young oysters on the beds last year, and they have grown very well.		6. —	6. —

APPENDIX No. 23.—ABSTRACT of Replies to Queries received

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE No. 82—31st Jan., 1868. Lough Swilly, County Donegal. Granted to William Hart. Present owners—Foyle and Bann Fishery Co.	LICENCE No. 83—11th February, 1868. Midleton River, County Cork. Granted to Richard Lyons.	LICENCE No. 85—13th March, 1868. Dunmanus Bay, County Cork. Granted to Stephen Browne.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	1. None.	1. 2,100, at 12*s.* per hundred of 126.	1. I have not sold any amount of oysters off my bed this year (1875), nor do I consider it advisable to do so at present, to interfere with the progress of the productiveness or growth of the bed, which appears to me to be slowly improving.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. 300,000.	2. Could not tell.	2. I cannot form an estimate, as I stated in a former report. Dunmanus bay is very open to the westerly gales, which bring in great swells with gravel, sand, and weeds, which do great injury to the oyster beds.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. None.	3. About the same quantity. Neither 1874 or 1875 were good years for spat.	3. There is a greater appearance of spat this year than last year. I have seen more small oysters (Ware) on deep strand this year than on any of the preceding four last years.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. Fattening.	4. Fattening.	4. As far as I have been able to learn my bed is better suited, by its sandy and gravelly bottom, for breeding than for fattening; but the *out-all*, as it is called (the swell), is always dangerous to the life and growth of the spat.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. Chief failure in non-production.	5. —	5. Its non-success, up to the present time, I attribute to several causes:—1. To the general failure of all shellfish in the bay for the four or five last years—even the lobsters, which in this bay used to produce in the English market £3,000 a year, have produced scarcely any amount for the last three years. 2. The out-all, or swell, which carries much gravel, sand, and weeds with it, and covers the beds. 3. There is a weed, called by the people here wool-weed, and which has been greatly increasing in the bay of late, which is a very fine grass weed, suffocates the oysters. 4. The difficulty of preventing poaching of late, oysters are fetching such a price.
6 State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.	6. —	6. —	6. I consider, in addition to the above causes of the diminution in the quantity of the oysters in the bay, that there are periods of productive years as there are periods of unproductive years in the propagation of oysters, and that the beds, natural as well as artificial, will recover by rest and care. Another branch of industry has grown up lately in the bay, which strongly illustrates the present dearth of shellfish. Numbers of little boys and girls are now employed in gathering the periwinkles on the rocks and weeds in the bay. They are sold at 5*s.* a bag, and taken weekly to England, I understand, where they are used, the people here say, instead of the oysters, crabs, and lobsters, which have left the bay.

QUERIES ISSUED.	LICENCE 94—14th June, 1869. Killala Bay, County Mayo. Granted to John W. Stratford.	LICENCE No. 97—10th September, 1869. Carlingford Lough, County Louth. Granted to Lord Clermont.	LICENCE No. 101—12th March, 1870. Ballysodare Bay, County Sligo. Granted to R. J. Verschoyle.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.		1. None sold this year.	
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?		2. About 120,000 of all sizes.	
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.		3. There has been some appearance of spat deposited on this bed in the last two or three years, but cannot say as to whether the quantity in the year 1875 was greater or less than in 1874.	
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?		4. For fattening.	
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	No replies received.	5. As a financial speculation, this oyster bed has not proved as yet successful, as the expenditure has much exceeded the receipts. This result is in some measure owing to the difficulty we experience in collecting the large oysters for sale. The situation of the bed being much exposed to north-westerly gales, it is necessary to keep the oysters near low-water mark, from whence they can be gathered only at low-water of spring tides; and during the lawful season for gathering oysters in Carlingford lough (from 1st Nov. to 1st March), there is not daylight at the time of low-water of spring tides.	See replies to Licence No. 121 (Queries No. 3) which equally refer to this bed.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.		6. If the lawful season for gathering oysters for sale were to commence in September instead of November, the difficulty mentioned above would be in a great measure removed; and if proper supervision were exercised to prevent the removal of small oysters, it is not likely that any injury would result from the change to the breeding-grounds in Carlingford lough.	

FISHERIES.

from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds—*continued.*

LICENCE No. 88—13th February, 1869. Ardrigole Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Right Hon. the Earl of Bantry.	LICENCE No. 89—13th February, 1869. Glengarriffe Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Right Hon. the Earl of Bantry.	LICENCE No. 91—11th March, 1869. Kenmare Bay, County Kerry. Granted to Richard J. Mahony.	LICENCE No. 92—11th March, 1869. Kenmare Bay, County Kerry. Granted to Thomas Kingston Sullivan.
No replies received.	No replies received.	1. None. 2. I could not possibly say, as this bed never exposes. 3. Not much. 4. Fattening. 5. — 6. —	1. 16,000, at 11*s.*; delivered in Cork. 2. Could not give a correct estimate. 3. I think much greater than last year. 4. Principally for fattening. 5. — 6. —

LICENCE No. 103—27th March, 1871. Ardgroom Harbour, County Kerry. Granted to Right Hon. the Earl of Bantry.	LICENCE No. 104—22nd March, 1871. Berehaven, County Cork. Granted to Right Hon. the Earl of Bantry and T. J. Leahy.	LICENCE No. 105—27th March, 1871. Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to Thomas Hicks.	LICENCE No. 109—15th July, 1871. Off the lands of Killydonnell, County Donegal. Granted to Sir James Stewart, Bart. Lessee—Owen Rice.
No replies received.	No replies received.	1. None. 2. I have no means of judging, as they are in deep water. 3. I think, like the preceding year, very little. 4. I laid the oysters down with the view to breeding, and wishing, if possible, to form good beds; have not yet taken any up. 5. I fear the water is too rough, except in very fine and exceptional seasons, to allow of the deposit of spat; and the spatting, from some cause or other, has been said to have been defective for some years. 6. —	1. A small sample lot only. 2. 2,750,000. 3. I am not aware of any improvement in spatting, which hitherto has been exceedingly limited. 4. I considered the bed well adapted for both breeding and fattening previous to my commencing operations; but from the small quantity of spat to be seen, as compared with the large number of oysters I have planted, I fear it is not so good for breeding as I know it is for fattening. 5. I anticipate the undertaking will be a success. 6. —

Oyster Fisheries.

Appendix No. 23.—Abstract of Replies to Queries received from Owners, Occupiers, or Lessees of Oyster Beds.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 110—27th July, 1871. Off the lands of Ardrummon, County Donegal. Granted to Francis Mansfield.	Licence No. 112—9th October, 1871. Dundrum Bay, County Down. Granted to the Most Hon. the Marquess of Downshire.	Licence No. 113—26th December, 1871. Ballynakill Harbour, County Galway. Granted to Major Henry Scott.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel. If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained?	1. 3,400 oysters, at 8*s.* per 100 for 1,200, sold early in the year; and 10*s.* per 100 for remainder.	1. There was not any sold. About 500 were taken up for use, and they were fully grown—in fair size and condition.	1. The total quantity sold last year off the beds were about 487,000, at prices from 4*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* per 100.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. 435,600 oysters.	2. 41,300 had been deposited in the enclosures during the years 1871 and 1872; but as some adhere to weeds, and are carried over the embankment, and allowing for other waste, I would suppose there is between 20,000 and 30,000 in the enclosures.	2. Cannot say, as oysters have been dredged from other beds (87,000) and laid on these beds.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. The amount of spat was not very considerable, but decidedly greater than in 1874.	3. There has not been any sign of spat since they were put down. Some collectors were placed, but there is a great difficulty from floating wrack and other weeds. The collectors were flat stones and bricks.	3. None.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. Fattening.	4. There are two small enclosures—one with a gravelly bottom, considered best adapted for breeding; the other, more in-shore, is mud, for growing and fattening—the latter is fairly up to expectations.	4. For fattening, but only to a limited extent.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. —	5. Cannot be said to have succeeded, although the oysters have grown to a fair average size; and if proper collectors could be placed and the fish retained within the enclosures it might succeed.	5. It has failed from there being no spat and the fish not fattening sufficiently for the market, compelling us to sell the oysters to be laid down again on other beds before fit for market.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.	6. The principal impediment to the cultivation of the oyster beds is the difficulty in obtaining seed oysters native to the lough (which, for many reasons, are much more desirable to obtain than foreign oysters), owing to the exportation of seed oysters from the lough, which is carried on to a great extent.	6. It is proposed to enclose part of the bed with stakes two or three inches apart, and so be able to retain the fish when covered by the tide.	6. —

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 118—3rd July, 1872. Achill Sound, County Mayo. Granted to James Rowan.	Licence No. 121—24th February, 1873. Ballisodare Bay, County Sligo. Granted to R. J. Verschoyle.	Licence No. 122—3rd March, 1873. Milk Haven, County Sligo. Granted to Mrs. J. L. Ecoles.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	1. None.	1. About 14,000 up to present; 11*s.* and 12*s.* per hundred.	1. None.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. The quantity is very small, as I could not for last two years get any to put on.	2. There ought to be about 600,000 on bed.	2. About 10,000.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. Same as 1874, I think.	3. I consider less than 1874. I have not seen any.	3. Not very much. About the same as 1874.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. Breeding.	4. Fattening.	4. Fattening.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. I could not say it has proved unsuccessful, but the oyster has very much disappeared for last two years in the Blacksod bay. Cannot prove successful until I have the bed first well stocked.	5. I consider it successful so far.	5. Though not altogether unsuccessful, still it has not progressed as rapidly as I expected, owing to shifting sands and a rapid current flowing over it.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.	6. I very much attribute the disappearance of the oysters in Blacksod bay from the severe and constant dredging that was kept on our bay last five years, which has left it presently with very little, as I am informed.	6. — See also Nos. 59 and 101.	6. I have been nursing the bed for some time, and on that account have not taken many oysters off it this season, but hope to get a good supply next year.

Queries Issued.	Licence No. 123—6th March, 1873. Cork Harbour, County Cork. Granted to Lieut.-Col. W. H. Longfield.	Licence No. 124—6th March, 1873. Roaringwater Bay, County Cork. Granted to Thomas Hicks.	Licence No 125—14th June, 1873. Barrow Harbour, County Kerry. Granted to Robert M'Cowan.
1. What amount of oysters was sold off your bed this year, and at what price per 100 or barrel? If sold by the barrel state about how much it contained.	1. There have not been more than 100 oysters taken from the bed this year, and these for home use only.	1. None.	1. 30,000, at £5 per 1,000—say 10*s.* per hundred.
2. What is your estimate of the present quantity of oysters of all sizes on your bed?	2. About 2,000.	2. As they are in deep water I have no means of judging.	2. About 100,000.
3. Was there much spat deposited on your bed this year? and state whether you consider it greater or less than in 1874.	3. There does not appear to have been much spat deposited.	3. I think, like the preceding year, very little.	3. We have not seen any spat.
4. What do you consider your bed best adapted for, breeding or fattening?	4. Fattening, as far as I can tell at present.	4. I laid the oysters down with the view of breeding; and wishing, if possible, to form good beds, I've not taken any up at present.	4. For fattening. They grow very fast on my bed, and the flavour is considered very good and much liked in Liverpool, where they fetched 10*s.* per hundred wholesale.
5. If your undertaking has proved unsuccessful state in what particular it has failed—whether in production or growth; and to what you attribute the non-success?	5. Having only come into residence here last May, I have not been able to pay as much attention to the bed as I hope to do next season, and cannot as yet form an opinion as to the probable success of the bed.	5. I fear the water is not sufficiently calm to allow of the deposits of the spat, excepting in very fine and exceptional seasons; and the spatting from some cause or other has been said to have been defective for some years.	5. The undertaking has been successful in growth and quality, but not in production; and I think the rapid flow out of the tide is a principal cause, and am considering the advisability of enclosing the bed with a sea wall, and thereby securing the spat in dead-water.
6. State any suggestions or statement you desire to make.	6. —	6. —	6. I have ordered 50,000 one-year oysters, 2 inches in diameter, and two-year, 2½ do., from France; and purpose ordering as much more if the first lot arrives in good condition.

Appendix, No. 24.

Rules for the Administration of Irish Reproductive Loan Fund, approved by His Grace the Lord Lieutenant in Council.

Whereas by "The Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act, 1874," it is enacted that the Lord Lieutenant in Council may, from time to time, make rules with respect to the following, among other matters:—The mode in which Loans are to be made under the said Act, the amount of such Loans, the securities to be given therefor, and the conditions on which such Loans will be made; and the circulation of information as to the mode in which Loans are to be applied for and made in pursuance of said Act: Now We, the Lord Lieutenant, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland, in pursuance of the powers vested in us as aforesaid, do hereby make the following rules:—

Rule 1.—The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries shall issue notices of the provisions of the Act in such form as from time to time they deem fit, and shall prepare forms of applications for Loans under the Act.

Rule 2.—On receipt by the Inspectors of Fisheries of any application for a Loan, the Inspectors shall make such inquiries as they may consider necessary into the solvency of the sureties proposed, and if satisfied as to their solvency, and the *bona fides* of the borrower or borrowers, shall make a report thereon to the Commissioners of Public Works, stating in said report the particulars required by the 5th section of the Act 37 and 38 Vic., cap. 86, and in addition thereto the mode of repayment and the number of years in which repayment to be made, and any other particulars they may consider necessary. Such report shall be signed by the three Inspectors, and shall be accompanied by the original form of application.

Rule 3.—In case the Inspectors shall require other sureties than those named in the original application, they may require the applicant to name other sureties, and may require such others as they can recommend as solvent to indorse on the original application their names as undertaking to become security for the borrower; or they may cause a new form of application to be made and signed by applicant and sureties.

Rule 4.—The maximum sum to be lent in one loan shall be £500, and the minimum £5.

Rule 5.—The general rate of interest chargeable on loans shall be at the rate of 2½ per cent. per annum.

Rule 6.—The loans shall be repayable by half-yearly instalments, including interest, extending over such period as the Inspectors may recommend, not exceeding in any case ten years.

Rule 7.—Loans may be advanced in one sum or by instalments, as the Inspectors may recommend.

Rule 8.—The form of security to be given for such loans, as recommended by the Inspectors, shall be a joint and several Bond or Promissory Note for the amount of loan.

Rule 9.—The borrower or his sureties may be at liberty at any time to repay the entire of the loan, or any part thereof greater than the amount of the instalment, previous to its becoming due, and shall thereupon get credit for the interest otherwise chargeable on the portion of principal so paid off in advance.

Rule 10.—The Inspectors may, at any time they consider necessary, inquire if the borrower is carrying into effect the undertaking for which the loan was made, and if satisfied that he is not, shall report the same to the Commissioners of Public Works.

Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin, the 13th day of January, 1875.

Whereas by "The Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act, 1874," it is enacted that The Lord Lieutenant in Council may, from time to time, make rules with respect to the following, among other matters:—

The mode in which Loans are to be made under the said Act, the amount of such Loans, the securities to be given therefor, and the conditions on which such Loans will be made; and the circulation of information as to the mode in which Loans are to be applied for and made in pursuance of said Act:

And the expression "Lord Lieutenant" is in the said Act explained as including the Lords Justices or other Chief Governors or Governor of Ireland for the time being:

And Whereas, upon the 13th day of January, 1875, The Lord Lieutenant in Council did, in pursuance of the said enactment, make certain Rules with respect to the matters therein mentioned:

And Whereas it is expedient that certain words should be added to Rule 8 of the aforesaid Rules of the 13th January, 1875:

Now We, The Lords Justices, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland, under and by virtue of the powers vested in Us as aforesaid, do hereby Order and Direct that the following words shall be added to Rule 8 of the aforesaid Rules of the 13th of January, 1875, viz.:—"When the Inspectors recommend it the Commissioners of Public works may take from the borrowers and their sureties a joint bond conditional for the due application of, as well as the repayment of the loan."

Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin, the 16th day of June, 1875.

Appendix, No. 25.

Table showing Loans applied for and advanced under the Irish Reproductive Loan Fund Act during the Year 1875.

County.	Amount available in 1875.	No. of Applications.	No. of Applicants.	Amount of Loans applied for in 1875.	No. of Loans recommended.	No. of Persons to whom Loans recommended.	Amount of Loans recommended in 1875.	No. of Loans actually issued.	Amount of Loans actually issued in 1875.	Loans cancelled or not perfected.	
										No.	Amount.
	£ s. d.			£ s. d.			£ s. d.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Cork, . .	1,134 16 9	196	214	7,766 0 0	64	71	1,200 0 0	59	1,060 0 0	7	185 0 0
Kerry, .	2,728 13 10	180	379	6,271 0 0	113	254	2,694 0 0	94	2,315 0 0	19	399 0 0
Leitrim, .	310 6 10	9	21	255 0 0	2	5	60 0 0	2	50 0 0	–	—
Limerick, .	559 7 8	8	10	80 0 0	–	–	—	–	—	–	—
Galway, .	1,405 1 8	469	1,445	17,277 0 0	80	221	1,382 0 0	64	1,162 0 0	16	220 0 0
Sligo, . .	521 3 11	61	72	1,754 0 0	33	41	540 0 0	30	482 0 0	3	52 0 0
Mayo, . .	851 10 11	281	633	6,311 0 0	72	176	858 0 0	62	754 0 0	10	104 0 0
Clare, . .	468 5 10	137	206	1,901 0 0	59	84	471 0 0	54	317 0 0	5	51 0 0
Total, .	7,979 7 5	1,341	2,980	41,615 0 0	423	852	7,205 0 0	365	6,120 0 0	60	1,011 0 0

APPENDIX, No. 26.

APPENDIX,

RESULT of INQUIRIES held by the SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS of IRISH FISHERIES into the

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
1	Barrow, otherwise Ross, otherwise Nore and Barrow Rivers conjoined.	Head Weir,	Thomas Murphy,	John H. Glascott,	Dunganstown,	Whitechurch,
2	Barrow River,	Ditto,	Arthur Kavanagh,	Arthur Kavanagh,	Drummin,	St. Mullin's
3	Barrow, otherwise Ross River, otherwise Nore and Barrow Rivers conjoined.	Ditto,	Joseph Hunt,	W. M. Glascott,	Mountanago,	Whitechurch,
4	Ditto,	Ditto,	Walter Sweetman,	Walter Sweetman,	Annaghs,	Shanbogh,
5	Ditto,	Ditto,	Michael and D. Cody,	—	Carrickloney,	Kilmakevoge,
6	Ditto,	Ditto,	James Doody.	—	Great Island,	Kilmokea,
7	Ditto,	Ditto,	Samuel Bennett,	—	Ditto,	Ditto,
8	Ditto,	Ditto,	Richard Cashen,	—	Shanbogh, Upper,	Shanbogh,
9	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Sherlock,	—	Great Island,	Kilmokea,
10	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Shanahan,	—	Ditto,	Ditto,
11	Ditto,	Ditto,	George Kent,	—	Ditto,	Ditto,
12	Suir,	Ditto,	John Lynch,	N. Power,	Faithlegg,	Faithlegg,
13	Ditto,	Ditto,	Hugh Treacey,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
14	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Walsh,	—	Cheekpoint,	Ditto,
15	Suir, Nore, and Barrow Rivers conjoined.	Ditto,	John Lynch,	—	Coolbunnia,	Ditto,
16	Ditto,	Stake Weir,	Michael Dobbyn,	Marquess of Waterford,	Crooke,	Crooke,
17	Ditto,	Ditto,	Eliza Coghlan,	J. J. D. Coghlan,	Dromina,	Ditto,
18	Nore,	Head Weir,	W. F. F. Tighe,	W. F. F. Tighe,	Innistioge,	Innistioge,
19	Barrow, otherwise Ross River, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Ditto,	Patrick Byrne,	E. W. Nunn,	Camlin,	Old Ross,
20	Barrow,	Ditto,	W. F. F. Tighe,	W. F. F. Tighe,	Kilconnelly,	The Rower,
21	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Eligot,	D. Burtchell,	Coolrainy,	Ditto,
22	Barrow, otherwise Ross River, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Ditto,	John Forrestal,	—	Carrickloney,	Kilmakevoge,
23	Nore River,	Ditto,	John Hunt,	Mrs. and Miss Vicars,	Brownsford,	Dysertmoon,
24	Suir River,	Ditto,	Paul Anderson,	N. A. Power,	Gorteens,	Rathpatrick,
25	Ditto,	Ditto,	Cath. and P. Moroney,	N. Power,	Drumdowney, Upper,	Ditto,
26	Barrow, otherwise Ross River, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Ditto,	Michael Irish,	Dr. J. Mackesy,	Ballyverneen,	Ballygurrin,
27	Ditto,	Ditto,	Thomas Murphy,	Col. Chas. Kearney,	Kearney's Bay,	Kilcolumb,
28	Ditto,	Ditto,	Joseph Hunt,	Peter Strange,	Rochestown,	Ditto,
29	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Hannebury,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
30	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Doyle,	J. Devereux,	Ringville,	Ditto,
31	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Bolger,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
32	Ditto,	Ditto,	W. Walsh,	Mrs. Bolton,	Drumdowney, Upper,	Rathpatrick,
33	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Sullivan,	P. Hannebury,	Ballinlaw,	Kilcolumb,
34	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Brien,	N. Power,	Drumdowney, Upper,	Rathpatrick,
35	Suir River,	Ditto,	David Bennett,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
36	Barrow, otherwise Ross River, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Ditto,	James Butler,	Samuel King,	Fisherstown,	Kilmokea,
37	Ditto,	Ditto,	Pierce Cox,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
38	Ditto,	Ditto,	James Kavanagh,	—	Ditto,	Ditto,
39	Suir, Nore, and Barrow conjoined, otherwise Waterford Harbour.	Scotch or Stake Weir.	A. Ryan, or Hayes,	Lord Templemore,	Duncannon,	St. James and Dunbrody.
40	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. Doyle,	Ditto,	Clonsharragh,	Ditto,
41	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. Stephens,	Ditto,	Duncannon,	Ditto,
42	Suir,	Head Weir,	N. A. Power,	N. A. Power,	Gorteens,	Rathpatrick,
43	Shannon River,	Fly-Net,	Randle Borough,	Randle Borough,	Querrin,	Moyarta
44	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	S. M'Auliffe,	Ditto,	Shangannagh,	Ditto,
45	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Kennedy,	John Cox,	Clarefield,	Ditto,
46	Ditto,	Ditto,	D. M'Auliffe,	Francis Keane,	Scattery Island,	Kilrush,
47	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	Francis Connell,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto
48	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	S. M'Auliffe,	Benjamin Cox,	Clarefield,	Moyarta,
49	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Connell and D. M'Auliffe.	Colonel Vandeleur,	Carrowncalla, S.,	Kilrush,
50	Ditto,	Ditto,	Francis Connell,	Francis Keane,	Scattery Island,	Ditto,
51	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
52	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Commins,	Colonel Vandeleur,	Inishbig or Hog Island,	Ditto,
53	Ditto,	Ditto,	James Connell,	Ditto,	Ballynote, West,	Ditto,
54	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Slattery,	Ditto,	Ballymacrinan,	Killimor,
55	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. M'Auliffe,	Ditto,	Lakyle, South,	Kilofin,
56	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
57	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. M'Auliffe and T. M'Namara.	Ditto,	Mount Shannon, West,	Ditto,
58	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	Marcus Sheehy,	Ditto,	Mount Shannon Wood,	Ditto,
59	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	Denis M'Auliffe,	Ditto,	Clookerry, West,	Ditto,
60	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	S. M'Auliffe,	Lord Leconfield,	Erribul,	Kilfidane,
61	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. Cunningham,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
62	Ditto,	Ditto,	James O'Neill,	William Ashe,	Shannakeabeg,	Ditto,
63	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Griffin,	James Kelly,	Cahiracon,	Kildysart,
64	Ditto (Clonderlaw Bay),	Ditto,	Daniel Molony,	Lord Annaly,	Kilkerrin,	Kilofin,
65	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
66	Ditto,	Ditto,	James Browne,	Ditto,	Lakyle, North,	Ditto,
67	Ditto,	Ditto,	D. Molony,	Ditto,	Ballina,	Ditto,
68	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Kilkerrin,	Ditto,
69	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	Thomas M'Mahon,	Richard Barclay,	Ballyartney,	Ditto,

No. 26.

Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland.

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Commissioners.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Commissioners Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
1	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	17 Oct. 1863,	Appeal,	Appeal withdrawn.
2	St. Mullin's,	Carlow,	To be abated; not having been legally erected in 1862.	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
3	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
4	Ida,	Kilkenny,	Ditto,	19 Oct. 1863,	Ditto,	Ditto.
5	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
6	Shelburne,	Wexford,	Ditto.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
7	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
8	Ida,	Kilkenny,	To be abated, not having been legally erected in 1862,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
9	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., cap. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
10	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, not having been legally erected in 1862,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
11	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation,	20 Oct. 1863,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
12	Gualtiere,	Waterford,	Ditto, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	21 Oct. 1863,	No appeal.	—
13	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
14	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
15	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
16	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	22 Oct. 1863,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
17	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	24 Oct. 1863,	Ditto,	Ditto.
18	Gowran,	Kilkenny,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation,	26 Oct. 1863,	Ditto,	Ditto.
19	Bantry,	Wexford,	Ditto, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
20	Ida,	Kilkenny,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
21	Ditto,	Ditto.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
22	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
23	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	27 Oct. 1863,	Ditto.	—
24	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	29 Oct. 1863,	Ditto.	—
25	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	10 Dec. 1863,	Ditto.	—
26	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Appeal withdrawn.
27	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	11 Dec. 1863,	Ditto,	Ditto.
28	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
29	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
30	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
31	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
32	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
33	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	12 Dec. 1863,	Ditto.	—
34	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
35	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
36	Shelburne,	Wexford,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Appeal withdrawn.
37	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
38	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
39	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation,	16 Dec. 1863,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
40	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as being erected in narrow channel,	4 April, 1865,	No appeal.	—
41	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation, and being illegally erected—extending beyond low-water mark.	23 Dec. 1863,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
42	Ida,	Kilkenny,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, and erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
43	Moyarta,	Clare,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by the 5th and 6th Vic., c. 106.	1 Jan. 1864,	Ditto.	—
44	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
45	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
46	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
47	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
48	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	2 Jan. 1864,	Ditto.	—
49	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
50	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
51	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
52	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
53	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
54	Clonderlaw,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
55	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	4 Jan. 1864,	No appeal.	—
56	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
57	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
58	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
59	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
60	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
61	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
62	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
63	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
64	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	7 Jan. 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed
65	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
66	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment affirmed.
67	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto, and not having been legally erected in 1862,	5 Jan. 1864,	No appeal.	—
68	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
69	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	7 Jan. 1864,	Ditto.	—

APPENDIX, No. 26.

APPENDIX No. 26.—RESULT of INQUIRIES held by the SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS of IRISH FISHERIES

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
70	River Barrow, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Head Weir,	Richard Hewitson,	M. W. Knox,	Kilmannock,	Kilmokea,
71	River Suir,	Di	G. Giles,	G. Giles,	Kilmurry,	Rathpatrick,
72	Rivers Suir, Nore, and Barrow conjoined, otherwise Waterford Harbour.	Stake Weir,	James Ryan,	Lord Ely,	Ballystraw,	Templetown,
73	Slade Bay,	Bag-Net,	W. Breen,	Ditto,	Slade,	Hook,
74	Suir, Nore, and Barrow conjoined.	Head Weir,	J. Hanlon and others,	Lord Templemore,	Nook,	St. James and Dunbrody.
75	Ditto,	Ditto,	Anthony Wallis,	Ditto,	Ballyhack,	Ditto,
76	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	Arthur N. O'Neill,	Lord Carew,	Woodstown, Lower,	Crooke,
77	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Knockaveelish,	Killea,
78	Suir, King's Channel,	Ditto,	Mary O'Neill,	Mary O'Neill,	Knockboy,	Ballygunner,
79	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
80	Suir, Nore, and Barrow conjoined.	Head Weir,	John Hanlon & others,	Lord Templemore,	Saltmills,	St. James and Dunbrody.
81	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ballyhack,	Ditto,
82	Shannon,	Stake-Net,	Stephen Cunningham,	Bryan O'Loghlen,	Ailroebeg,	Kilfidane,
83	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	R. W. C. Reeves,	R. W. C. Reeves,	Poulnadaree,	Killimor,
84	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Burrane, Lower,	Ditto,
85	Ditto,	Ditto	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
86	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
87	Ditto,	Ditto,	Michael Colpoys,	Colonel Hickman,	Knock,	Kilmurry,
88	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. M'Cauliffe & John Brooks.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
89	Ditto,	Ditto,	Eliza Hodnett,	Ditto,	Kilmore,	Ditto,
90	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
91	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
92	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Houlehan,	Ditto,	Carrowbane,	Ditto,
93	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. Pegum,	Rev. T. Butler,	Poulnadaree,	Killimor,
94	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
95	Ditto,	Ditto,	Henry S. O'Brien,	Henry S. O'Brien,	Portdrine,	Kilfintinan,
96	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. M'Auliffe,	T. R. Henn,	Slievedooley,	Kilofin,
97	Ditto,	Ditto,	T. Naughten & others,	E. T. Massey,	Ballycanauna,	Ballysteen,
98	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. Shaughnessy and others.	Lord Guillamore,	Courtbrown,	Askeaton,
99	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. M'Cauliffe,	Colonel Hickman,	Knock,	Kilmurry,
100	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Browne,	Lord Monteagle,	Leahys,	Robertstown,
101	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Durnish,	Shanagolden,
102	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Foynes Island,	Robertstown,
103	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
104	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Mount Trenchard,	Loghill,
105	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
106	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Sheean,	Lord Clare,	Ballynash (Clare),	Robertstown,
107	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. M'Namarra,	R. Bateson,	Loghill,	Loghill,
108	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Griffin,	Thomas Royse,	Carrowbanebeg,	Ditto,
109	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. M'Namarra,	Earl of Clare,	Ditto,	Ditto,
110	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Browne,	C. Minchin,	Killacolla,	Kilfergus,
111	Ditto,	Ditto,	Margaret Putland and others.	Knight of Glin,	Caheragh,	Ditto,
112	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Glin Demesne,	Ditto,
113	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Farranmiller,	Ditto,
114	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Browne,	Elizabeth Standish,	Killacolla (Barker),	Ditto,
115	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	W. B. Barrington,	W. B. Barrington,	Ballyhoolahan,	Loghill,
116	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Browne,	Rev. R. Fitzgerald,	Ballydonohoe,	Kilfergus,
117	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	P. J. Mayne,	P. J. Mayne,	East Astee,	Ahavallin,
118	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	West Astee,	Ditto,
119	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Pim,	W. C. Hickey,	Cloonaman,	Ditto,
120	Ditto,	Ditto,	C. Sandes,	C. Sandes,	Carrig Island,	Ditto,
121	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Pim,	R. Leslie,	Kilcolgan, Lower,	Kilnaughten,
122	Ditto,	Ditto,	Alicia Wren,	Lord Listowel,	Corcas and Sand Hills,	Kilconnelly,
123	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Castlequarter,	Ditto,
124	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	Ditto,	Leslie Wren,	Kylatallen,	Ditto,
125	Ditto,	Ditto,	W. Sandes,	T. Sandes,	Carhoonakinneely,	Kilnaughten,
126	Ditto,	Ditto,	Alicia Wren,	Leslie Wren,	Carrigane,	Ahavallin,
127	Sea off Coast of County Cork,	Bag-Net,	C. Desmond,	Samuel Hodder,	Ringabella,	Tracton,
128	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	W. Atkinson,	Lord Ponsonby,	Redbarn,	Clonpriest,
129	Ditto,	Ditto,	N. T. Foley,	Murdock Green,	Summerfield,	Youghal,
130	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	J. Ronayne,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
131	Ditto,	Fly-Net,	N. T. Foley,	D. L. Lewis,	Claycastle,	Ditto,

into the Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland—*con.*

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Commissioners.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Commissioners Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
70	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, and as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	10 Mar. 1864,	Appeal,	Sent back for further inquiry as to partial abatement.—See No. 272.
71	Ida,	Kilkenny,	Ditto,	14 Mar. 1864,	No appeal.	—
72	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	15 Mar. 1864,	Appeal,	Withdrawn.
73	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
74	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	16 Mar. 1864.	—	—
75	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Withdrawn.
76	Gaultiere,	Waterford,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	17 Mar. 1864,	Ditto,	Sent back for reconsideration.—See Nos. 261 to 264 inclusive.
77	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	
78	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	18 Mar. 1864,	Ditto,	
79	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	
80	Shelburne,	Wexford,	To be abated, Lord Templemore consenting,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
81	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
82	Clonderlaw,	Clare,	Legally erected,	26 Mar. 1864.	—	—
83	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; not erected in 1862,	28 Mar. 1864,	No appeal.	—
84	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106; and extending beyond low-water mark. The latter question to be tried by Commissioners when appeal on title decided.	29 Mar. 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
85	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Sent back.—See No. 266.
86	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106, and as being injurious to navigation.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment affirmed.
87	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; not erected in 1862,	30 Mar. 1864,	Ditto,	Ditto.
88	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
89	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, and as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	31 Mar. 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
90	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment reversed.
91	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; not erected in 1862,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment affirmed.
92	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, and as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
93	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated by consent of Mr. Butler,	2 April, 1864,	No appeal.	—
94	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
95	Bunratty, Lr.	Ditto,	To be abated, as being injurious to navigation, and to the public right of fishing.	4 April, 1864,	Appeal,	New trial granted upon point of form, see No. 250.
96	Clonderalaw,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
97	Kenry,	Limerick,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
98	Lower Connello.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
99	Clonderalaw,	Clare,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
100	Shanid,	Limerick,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation,	5 April, 1864,	Ditto.	—
101	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106, and injurious to public right of fishing.	6 April, 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
102	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
103	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
104	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
105	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated by consent; not erected in 1862,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
106	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	7 April, 1864,	Ditto.	—
107	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
108	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
109	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, not having been erected in 1862,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
110	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
111	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Sent back.—See No. 265.
112	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; injurious to navigation,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
113	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
114	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	8 April, 1864,	Appeal,	Appeal withdrawn.
115	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
116	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106, and not erected in 1862.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
117	Iraghticonnor	Kerry,	To be abated; not legally erected in 1862, and injurious to the public right of fishing.	11 April, 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
118	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
119	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment reversed.
120	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; not erected in 1862,	Ditto,	No appeal.	—
121	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
122	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
123	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
124	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto, and not erected in 1862,	12 April, 1864,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
125	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment affirmed.
126	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as injurious to public rights of fishing.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment reversed; but public right of fishing preserved.
127	Kinalea,	Cork,	To be abated, as being within three miles of Carrigaline River mouth.	4 Aug. 1864,	Ditto,	Judgment reversed.
128	Imokilly,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	8 Aug. 1864,	No appeal.	—
129	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
130	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
131	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—

Appendix, No. 26.

Appendix No. 26.—Result of Inquiries held by the Special Commissioners of Irish Fisheries

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
132	Sea off Coast of co. Cork,	Bag-Net,	John Walsh,	Roger Davis,	Knockadoon,	Youghal,
133	Ditto,	Ditto,	D. Sullivan,	M. Longfield,	Ballycotton,	Kilmahon,
134	Ballycotton Bay, co. Cork,	Ditto,	J. Litton,	J. Litton,	Ditto,	Ditto,
135	River Blackwater,	Stake-Net,	R. Power,	Trustees of Mrs. Osborne.	Pillpark,	Clashmore,
136	Ditto,	Ditto,	F. Kennedy and others,	Lord Stuart de Decies,	Timknock,	Ditto,
137	Ditto,	Ditto,	H. T. Dennehy,	Ditto,	Ardsallagh,	Ditto,
138	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Ronayne,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
139	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
140	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. B. Ronayne,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
141	Ditto,	Ditto,	G. Crotty,	Ditto,	Coolbagh,	Ditto,
142	Ditto,	Head Weir,	G. Dalton,	Ditto,	Dromana,	Affane,
143	Ditto,	Stake-Net,	M. G. Adams,	Hon. C. W. M. Smythe,	Rincrew,	Templemichael,
144	Ditto,	Ditto,	Hon. C. W. M. Smythe,	Ditto,	Ballynatray,	Ditto,
145	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. M'Sweeney,	—	Templemichael,	Ditto,
146	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. Allen & N. T. Foley,	Samuel Allen,	D'Loughtane,	Kinsalebeg,
147	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Sliney & J. Harley,	—	Newport, East,	Templemichael,
148	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Doolan,	Lord Huntingdon,	Ballynaclash,	Clashmore,
149	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. Ronayne,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
150	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Mansfield,	J. Kiely,	Newport, East,	Kilcockan,
151	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. White & W. Murphy,	—	Strancally,	Ditto,
152	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. White,	—	Carnglass,	Ditto,
153	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. Cotter,	Lord Stuart de Decies,	Tinnascart,	Aglish,
154	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. M'Sweeney,	—	Stael,	Templemichael,
155	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Neil and W. Hennessey.	Rev. G. Gumbleton,	Scart,	Kilcockan,
156	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. Browne and Michl. M'Carthy.	C. Musgrave,	Glenassy, or Clooneen,	Aglish,
157	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Fitzgerald,	C. O'Mahony,	Ballyphillip, East,	Kilcockan,
158	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. Healy,	J. Hargrave,	Dromore,	Aglish,
159	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Collins,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
160	Ditto,	Ditto,	Maurice Hickey,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
161	Ditto,	Head Weir,	C. Ussher,	C. Ussher,	Camphire,	Lismore,
162	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Rice.	—	Killahaly, East,	Ditto,
163	Ditto,	Ditto,	Sir R. Musgrave,	Sir R. Musgrave,	Turin Demesne,	Ditto,
164	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Norrisland,	Ditto,
165	Bride,	Ditto,	M. Whelan,	C. Ussher,	Camphire,	Ditto,
166	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Grath,	Ditto,	O'Kyle,	Ditto,
167	Ditto,	Ditto,	P. Walsh,	C. Smith,	Snugborough,	Kilwatermoy,
168	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Connell,	Duke of Devonshire,	Bridane, Lower,	Lismore,
169	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. P. Maxwell,	R. P. Maxwell,	Killanthony,	Kilwatermoy,
170	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. Evans,	R. Oliver,	Ballynaraha,	Lismore,
171	Ditto,	Ditto,	T. Hannigan,	Duke of Devonshire,	Kilnacarriga,	Ditto,
172	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Barry,	Ditto,	Ballinvella,	Ditto,
173	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. P. Maxwell,	R. P. Maxwell,	Sapperton, North,	Kilwatermoy,
174	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Mangan,	Duke of Devonshire,	Ballinvella,	Lismore,
175	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. Leahy,	Ditto,	Monatrim,	Ditto,
176	Ardmore Bay,	Bag-Net.	T. Geary,	E. O'Dell,	Duffcarrick,	Ardmore,
177	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Dysert,	Ditto,
178	Castlemaine Harbour,	Stake-Net,	H. W. Dodd & others,	The M'Gillycuddy,	Killenagh,	Ballinvoher,
179	Ditto,	Ditto,	F. Ashe,	Reps. Lord Ventry,	Lack,	Ditto,
180	Ditto,	Ditto,	H. W. Dodd & others,	E. Mahony,	Dooaghs,	Killorglin,
181	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illaunstook,	Ditto,
182	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. De Moleyns,	Reps. Lord Ventry,	Cromane, Lower,	Ditto,
183	Ditto,	Ditto,	Sir R. Blennerhassett,	Sir R. Blennerhassett,	Douglas,	Ditto,
184	Ballinskelligs Bay,	Bag-Net,	W. Hector,	E. Reeves,	Dungeagan,	Prior,
185	Kenmare River,	Ditto,	M. O'Sullivan,	E. B. Hartopp,	Rath,	Kilcrohane,
186	Sea off Coast of co. Louth,	Ditto,	T. A Newcomen,	Smith Barry,	Glaspistol,	Clogher,
187	Ditto,	Ditto,	Arthur and Jane Newcomen.	Arthur Newcomen,	Callystown,	Ditto,
188	Ditto,	Ditto,	T. Kirk,	A. Godley,	Clogher,	Ditto,
189	Ditto,	Ditto,	Jane S. Newcomen,	Arthur Newcomen,	Callystown	Ditto,
190	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
191	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. Jones,	Sir A. Bellingham,	Dunany,	Dunany,
192	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Jones,	Ditto,	Drahanstown,	Ditto,
193	Ditto,	Ditto,	T. Kirk,	A. Godley,	Clogher,	Clogher,
194	Ditto,	Head Weir,	J. M'Keon,	Sir A. Bellingham,	Castlebellingham,	Gernonstown,
195	Sea off Coast of co. Antrim,	Bag-Net,	Charles Black,	Lord Antrim,	Portrush,	Dunluce,
196	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
197	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
198	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
199	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
200	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
201	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
202	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Reaney,	Ditto,	Torr,	Culleightrin,
203	Ditto,	Ditto,	N. D. Crommellin,	Ditto,	Ballyteerim,	Ditto,
204	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. M'Keegan,	Ditto,	Glebe,	Layd,
205	Ditto,	Ditto,	Lord Antrim,	Ditto,	Carnlough,	Ardclinis,
206	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Townparks, Glenarm,	Tickmacrevan,
207	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Intosh,	H. H. M'Neile,	Rodbay,	Layd,
208	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. M'Keegan,	Charles Black,	Moneyvert,	Ditto,

into the Legality or Illegality of Fixed nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland—*con.*

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Commissioners.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Commissioners Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
132	Imokilly, .	Cork, .	To be abated, being within three miles of mouth of Womanagh River.	8 Aug. 1864,	No appeal.	—
133	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Postponed.	—	—	—
134	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Legally erected, ...	29 June 1865,	No appeal.	—
135	Decies-within-Drum.	Waterford, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	12 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
136	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, by consent, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
137	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
138	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
139	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
140	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
141	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
142	Decies-without-Drum.	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
143	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto, ...	13 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
144	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	15 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
145	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	16 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
146	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
147	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
148	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	To be abated by consent of Lord Huntingdon, .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
149	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
150	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
151	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
152	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated by consent, . . .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
153	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	17 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
154	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto, .	Appeal, .	Sent back.—See 273.
155	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated so far as it extends beyond low-water-mark; legally erected as regards the rest.	Ditto, .	Ditto, . .	Judgment affirmed.—See 275.
156	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto, .	No appeal.	—
157	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
158	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto. .	Ditto.	—
159	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto. .	Appeal, . .	Sent back.—See 274.
160	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	No appeal.	—
161	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Ditto, .	To be abated; not erected in 1862, . .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
162	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated, as injurious to navigation, .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
163	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
164	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
165	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
166	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
167	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
168	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
169	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
170	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
171	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
172	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
173	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
174	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
175	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
176	Decies-within-Drum.	Ditto, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
177	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
178	Corkaguiny,	Kerry, .	Ditto, ...	22 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
179	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
180	Iveragh, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
181	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
182	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	23 Aug. 1864,	Appeal, . .	Appeal withdrawn.
183	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated; not erected in 1862, .	Ditto, .	No appeal.	—
184	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated, within three miles of mouth of Inny River.	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
185	Dunkerron, S.	Ditto, .	Legally erected, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
186	Ferrard, .	Louth, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	26 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
187	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
188	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
189	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
190	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
191	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
192	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Legally erected, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
193	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	27 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
194	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Legally erected, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
195	Lr. Dunluce,	Antrim, .	Ditto, ...	29 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
196	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
197	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
198	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
199	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
200	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
201	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated; injurious to navigation, .	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
202	Carey, .	Ditto, .	Legally erected, ...	30 Aug. 1864,	Ditto.	—
203	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	To be abated; within 3 miles of mouth of Cushendun River.	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
204	Lr. Glenarm,	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—
205	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ditto Glenarm River,	Ditto, .	Appeal, . .	Judgment reversed.
206	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto; in Estuary of Glenarm River, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, . .	Judgment affirmed.
207	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto; within 3 miles of mouths of Cushendall and Glenarriffe Rivers.	Ditto, .	No appeal.	—
208	Ditto, .	Ditto, .	Ditto, ...	Ditto, .	Ditto.	—

APPENDIX, No. 26.

APPENDIX No. 26.—RESULT of INQUIRIES held by the SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS of IRISH FISHERIES

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
209	Sea off coast of co. Antrim,	Bag-Net,	Thomas Tait,	A. Boyd,	Ballycastle,	Ramoan,
210	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
211	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Gildowney,	J. M'Gildowney,	Clarepark,	Ditto,
212	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. M'Quilkin,	J. K. Tenant,	Cregganboy,	Ditto,
213	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. Woodside,	Ditto.	Ditto,	Ditto,
214	Ditto,	Ditto,	H. Dickson,	G. E. Fullerton,	Carrick-a-rede Island,	Ballintoy,
215	Ditto,	Ditto,	H. Kelly,	Ditto,	Larrybane,	Ditto,
216	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. Stewart,	Sir E. M'Naghten,	Portbradden,	Ditto,
217	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. E. Leslie,	Templastragh,	Ditto,
218	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Alister,	E. M'Neile,	Carrysherkin,	Ditto,
219	Ditto,	Ditto,	F. Mills,	J. C. Anderson,	Portmoon - Feigh Mountain.	Dunseverick,
220	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
221	Ditto,	Ditto,	W. Gregg,	Sir E. M'Naghten,	Ardihannon,	Billy,
222	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Bushfoot,	Dunluce,
223	Sea off Coast of co. Londonderry,	Ditto,	H. O'Neill,	A. Shuldham and Hon. Mrs. Campbell.	East Ballygeelagh,	Ballyaghran,
224	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Keenan,	Sir H. H. Bruce,	Freehall,	Dunbogh,
225	Sea off coast of co. Donegal,	Ditto,	C. M'Kinney,	Rev. S. Montgomery,	Glenagiveney,	Lower Moville,
226	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. S. Nicholson,	Mossy Glen,	Ditto,
227	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Anne Kean,	Ballynagaragh,	Ditto,
228	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	E. M'Clelland,	Ballycharry,	Ditto,
229	Ditto,	Ditto,	B. Sheffry,	J. S. Nicholson,	Tirmacronagh,	Culdaff,
230	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. Maddison,	R. C. Stewart,	Horn Head,	Clondahorky,
231	Sea off Coast of co. Londonderry,	Ditto,	R. Stewart,	Sir H. H. Bruce,	Ballymaclary,	Magilligan,
232	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Doaghs,	Ditto,
233	Lough Foyle,	Stake-Net,	R. Allen,	Irish Society,	Gransha,	Glendermott,
234	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
235	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
236	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ballynashalloge,	Templemore,
237	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
238	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Culmore,	Ditto,
239	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Culmore Level,	Ditto,
240	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Lower Campsey,	Faughanvale,
241	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Coolkeeragh,	Glendermott,
242	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
243	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Culmore,	Culmore,
244	River Erne,	Ditto,	Alicia Sheil,	Thomas Connolly,	Fenner,	Innismacsaint,
245	Sea off Coast of co. Sligo,	Bag-Net,	William Petrie,	Ormsby Jones,	Streedagh,	Ahamlish,
246	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Little,	R. Orme,	Carrowhubback,	Kilglass,
247	Sea off Coast of co. Mayo,	Ditto,	M. Flynn,	Colonel Knox,	Castletown or Lackan,	Lackan,
248	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Little,	Rev. J. M'Naughten,	Ballinlena,	Kilcummin,
249	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Rev. C. L. Thomas,	Ballygarry,	Ditto,
250	Shannon River,	Stake-Net,	H. S. O'Brien,	H. S. O'Brien,	Portdrine,	Kilfintinan,
251	Bantry Bay, Glengariffe Har.,	Bag-Net,	Lord Bantry,	Lord Bantry,	Moontecnsudder,	Kilcaskin,
252	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
253	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
254	Bantry Bay, Adrigole Harbour,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Adrigole,	Ditto,
255	Sea off co. Mayo,	Ditto,	Alexander Hector,	William Pike,	Achillbeg,	Achill,
256	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
257	Sea off Achill Island,	Ditto,	Ditto,	M. M. Blacker,	Keem Net,	Ditto,
258	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	C. Baycott,	Gupresheen,	Achill,
259	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	West Net,	Ditto,
260	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Trustees Achill Mission,	Keel,	Ditto,
261	Waterford Harbour,	Stake-Net,	A. N. O'Neill,	A. N. O'Neill,	Woodstown,	Crooke,
262	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Knockaveelish,	Ditto,
263	River Suir, King's Channel,	Ditto,	A. N. O'Neill and Mary O'Neill.	A. N. O'Neill and Mary O'Neill.	Knockboy,	Ballygower,
264	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
265	River Shannon,	Ditto,	Jn. Jameson & others,	Knight of Glin,	Caheragh,	Kilfergus,
266	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. W. C. Reeves,	R. W. C. Reeves,	Burrane, Lower,	Killimor,
267	Lower Bunratty,	Head Weir,	Thomas Studdart,	Thomas Studdart,	Bunratty,	Bunratty,
268	Sea off the Coast of co. Sligo,	Bag-Net,	William Petrie,	Lady Palmerston and Hon. W. Cowper.	Mullaghmore,	Ahamlish,
269	Killala Bay,	3 Bag-Nets,	William Little,	R. Orme,	Carrowhubback,	Kilglass,
270	Sea off Coast of co. Sligo,	Bag-Net,	William Petrie,	O. Jones,	Streedagh,	Ahamlish,
271	Sea off Coast of co. Londonderry,	Ditto,	Sir H. Bruce,	Sir H. Bruce,	Ballymaclary,	Magilligan,
272	Sea off co. Sligo,	Ditto,	Lady Palmerston and Hon. W. Gowper.	—	Mullaghmore,	Ahamlish,
273	River Blackwater,	Stake-Net,	E. M'Sweeny,	—	Stael,	Templemichael,
274	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Collins,	J. Hargrave,	Dromore,	Aglish,
275	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Neil and W. Hennessey.	Rev. G. Gumbleton,	Scart,	Kilcockan,
276	River Barrow, otherwise Nore and Barrow conjoined.	Head Weir,	M. W. Knox,	M. W. Knox,	Kilmannock	Kilmokea,
277	Sea off co. Donegal,	Bag-Net,	George Young,	—	Carthage,	Culdaff,
278	Shannon,	Stake-Net,	Daniel Moloney,	Lord Annaly,	Lakyle, North,	Kilofin,
279	Ditto,	Ditto,	Synan M'Auliffe,	Thomas Rice Henn,	Slievedooley,	Ditto,
280	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. W. C. Reeves,	R. W. C. Reeves,	Burrane, Lower,	Killimor,
281	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
282	Ditto,	Ditto,	Robert Leslie,	Robert Leslie,	Tarbert,	Kilnaughten,
283	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Sandes,	William Sandes,	Ralappane,	Ditto,
284	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,

into the Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland—*con.*

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Commissioners.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Commissioners Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
209	Carey,	Antrim,	To be abated; within 3 miles of Ballycastle River,	30 Aug. 1864,	No appeal.	—
210	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
211	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
212	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
213	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
214	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
215	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
216	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
217	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
218	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
219	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
220	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
221	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; within Estuary of Bush River,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
222	Lr. Dunluce,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
223	Coleraine,	Londonderry,	Legally erected,	31 Aug. 1864,	No Appeal.	—
224	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; within three miles of mouth of Bann River.	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
225	Inishowen,	Donegal,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	3 Sept. 1864,	Ditto.	—
226	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
227	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
228	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
229	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
230	Kilmacrenan,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
231	Keenaght,	Londonderry,	Ditto,	5 Sept. 1864,	Appeal,	Sent back on motion before hearing of appeal, to enable the owner to make a case abandoned at first trial.—See No. 271.
232	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated; within Estuary of Foyle River,	Ditto,	No Appeal.	—
233	Tirkeeran,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	—	Ditto.	—
234	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
235	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
236	City & Liberties,	Ditto,	To be abated; injurious to navigation,	—	Ditto.	—
237	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
238	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
239	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
240	Tirkeeran,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
241	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
242	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
243	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
244	Tyrhugh,	Donegal,	Legally erected,	8 Sept. 1864,	Ditto.	—
245	Carbury,	Sligo,	See No. 270.	—	—	—
246	Tireragh,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	10 Sept. 1864,	Appeal,	Sent back in consequence of the evidence at first trial being defective.—See No. 269.
247	Tyrawley,	Mayo,	Ditto,	12 Sept. 1864,	No Appeal.	—
248	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
249	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Judgment affirmed.
250	Lr. Bunratty	Clare,	To be abated, as injurious to navigation and public rights of fishing, and as erected on the site of a weir previously condemned. *Vide* sec. 17 of 13 & 14 Vic., c. 88.	17 Sept. 1864,	Ditto,	Ditto.
251	Bere,	Cork,	To be abated; within Estuary of River,	8 May, 1867.	—	—
252	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
253	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
254	Ditto,	Ditto,	Abandoned,	Ditto.	—	—
255	Burrishoole,	Mayo,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	12 July, 1865,	No Appeal.	—
256	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
257	Ditto,	Ditto,	Postponed for further evidence,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
258	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto.	Ditto.	—
259	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
260	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—
261	Gualtiere,	Waterford,	(See 75 to 78 inclusive.) Report made to Court of second trial.	No Judgment,	Set down on report,	Judgment reversed.
262	Ditto,	Ditto,		Ditto,	Ditto,	
263	Ditto,	Ditto,		Ditto,	Ditto,	
264	Ditto,	Ditto,		Ditto,	Ditto,	
265	Shanid,	Limerick,	Report made to Court,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
266	Clonderalaw,	Clare,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.
267	Lr. Bunratty,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	10 Nov. 1866,	No appeal.	—
268	Carbury,	Sligo,	Ditto,	14 Nov. 1866,	Ditto.	—
269	Tireragh,	Ditto,	Report made to Court. (See 355),			
270	Carbury,	Ditto,	Legally erected,	14 Nov. 1866,	No appeal.	—
271	Keenaght,	Londonderry,	Report made to Court,	20 Nov. 1866,	Set down on report,	Judgment reversed.
272	Carbury,	Sligo,	Illegal. Within 3 miles of mouth of Duff River,	15 June, 1867,	Appeal,	Judgment affirmed.
273	Decies-with-in-Drum.	Waterford,	Report made to Court,	No Judgment,	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
274	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Appeal withdrawn.
275	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	4 Jan. 1868,	No appeal.	—
276	Shelburne,	Wexford,	Report to Court—That it is injurious to navigation—25th February, 1868.	No Judgment,	Set down on report,	Judgment affirmed.
277	Innishowen,	Donegal,	Legal,	6 Mar. 1868.	No appeal.	—
278	Clonderalaw,	Clare,	To be abated,	12 Nov. 1868.	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
279	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	No Appeal.	—
280	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	Appeal,	Judgment reversed.
281	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	Ditto,	Ditto.
282	Iraghticonnor,	Kerry,	—	17 Nov. 1868.	—	—
283	Ditto,	Ditto,	To be abated,	Ditto.	—	—
284	Ditto,	Ditto,	Given up by Mr. Nelligan. Not erected or used either as Bag or Stake Net in 1862.	Ditto.	—	—

APPENDIX, No. 26.

APPENDIX No. 26.—RESULT of INQUIRIES held by the INSPECTORS of IRISH FISHERIES into

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
285	Sea off Coast co. Antrim,	Fixed Draft Net	Denis Black,	Denis Black,	Moneyvart,	Layd,
286	Ditto,	Ditto,	Archibald M'Keegan,	Earl of Antrim,	Glebe,	Layd,
287	Sea off Coast co. Cork,	Stake-Net,	Sampson French,	Sampson French,	Cuskinney,	Templerobin,
288	Coomhola River (estuary),	Fixed Draft,	R. Vickery,	Earl of Bantry,	Dromkeal,	Kilmackmoge,
289	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. Warner,	Ditto,	Reenadesert,	Ditto,
290	Ouvane River,	Ditto,	William Sullivan,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
291	Sea off Coast co. Cork,	Ditto,	Michael Murphy,	Ditto,	Reendonegan,	Kilmacologue,
292	Donemark River (estuary),	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Gurteenroe and Newtown.	Ditto,
293	Shannon,	Stake-Net,	Thomas Sandes,	Thomas Sandes,	Coolnanoonagh,	Kilnaughten,
294	Sea off Coast co. Antrim,	Fixed Draft Net	Sir H. H. Boyd,	Sir H. H. Boyd,	Townparks,	Ramoan,
295	Ditto,	Ditto,	Archibald M'Keegan,	Earl of Antrim,	Glebe,	Layd,
296	Ditto,	Ditto,	John Finlay,	John Finlay,	Ballyteerim,	Culleightrin,
297	Ditto,	Ditto,	Henry H. M'Neill,	H. H. M'Neill,	Redbay,	Layd,
298	Ditto,	Ditto,	Edmund M'Neill,	Edmund M'Neill,	Currysheskin,	Ballintoy,
299	Ditto,	Ditto,	Denis Black,	Denis Black,	Moneyvart,	Layd,
300	Ditto,	Ditto,	John M'Gildowny,	John M'Gildowny,	Clare,	Ramoan,
301	Ditto,	Ditto,	Robert Stewart,	James Leslie,	Templastragh,	Ballintoy,
302	Ditto,	Fixed Draft Net	Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.,	Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.,	Gregganboy,	Ditto,
303	Sea off Coast co. Londonderry,	Ditto,	John Cromie,	John Cromie,	North Mullaghacall,	Ballyaghran,
304	Ditto,	4 Ditto,	Henry O'Neill,	Arnold White and John P. Broughton.	East & West Tullaghmurray & Crossreagh.	Ditto,
305	Ditto,	Fixed Draft Net	Sir H. H. Bruce, bt.,	Sir H. H. Bruce, bt.	Ballymaclary,	Tamlaghtard,
306	Estuary of Inver River,	2 Ditto,	William Sinclair,	William Sinclair,	Inver Estuary,	Inver,
307	Eske River,	Fixed Draft Net	Earl of Arran,	Earl of Arran,	Eske River,	Donegal, and Inver.
308	Sea off Coast co. Donegal,	Ditto,	Marquis Conyngham,	Marquis Conyngham,	Ballyederlan,	Killaghtee,
309	Ditto,	Bag-Net,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
310	Estuary of Leannan River,	2 Fixed Draft Nets.	E. Kelly,	Sir Jas. Stewart, bt.,	Leannan River,	Aughnish,
311	Sea off Coast co. Donegal,	1 Ditto,	W. R. Tredennick,	W. R. Tredennick,	Killulton,	Killaghtee,
312	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ballycroy,	Ditto,
313	Ditto,	Ditto,	S. Sheil,	S. Sheil,	Magheracar,	Innishmacsaint,
314	Ditto,	Ditto,	Mrs. S. M'Donnell,	Mrs. S. M'Donnell,	Ballysaggart,	Killaghtee,
315	Ditto,	Ditto,	A. Hamilton,	A. Hamilton,	Coolmore,	Kilbarron,
316	Ditto,	Ditto,	Murray Stewart,	Murray Stewart,	Gortalia,	Kilcar,
317	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Mucross,	Ditto,
318	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ebenezer Bustard,	Ebenezer Bustard,	Drumanoo,	Killybegs,
319	Ditto,	Ditto,	James Hawkins,	—	Ballybodonell, &c.,	Killaghtee,
320	River Moy,	6 Ditto,	Mary Anne Little and Andrew Clarke.	Mary Anne Little and A. Clarke.	—	—
321	Ditto,	3 Ditto,	William Petrie,	John Wingfield Stratford.	Scurmore,	Castleconor,
322	Sea off Coast of Sligo,	1 Ditto,	J. Carnegy,	Richard G. Brinkley,	Sraheens,	Easkey,
323	River Owenmore,	3 Ditto,	William Petrie,	—	—	—
324	Tullaghan Bay,	7 Ditto,	Helen Little,	—	Tullaghan Bay,	Kilmore, &c.,
325	Blackwater,	Stake-Weir,	Hon. C. Wm. Moore-Smyth.	Hon. C. Wm. Moore-Smyth.	Ballynatray,	Templemichael
326	Shannon,	Ditto,	Capt. R. Leslie,	Capt. R. Leslie,	Tarbert,	Kilnaughten,
327	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Kilpadogue,	Ditto,
328	Ditto,	Ditto,	Thomas Sandes,	Thomas Sandes,	Rallapane,	Ditto,
329	Sea off Coast co. Sligo,	1 Fixed Draft Net.	James Hale,	James Hale,	Killeenduff,	Easky,
330	Sligo River,	2 Ditto,	William Petrie,	Captain Martin,	Ballinearand Cartron,	Kilmore,
331	Erne River	3 Ditto,	Ballyshannon Fishery Company.	—	Carrickboy and Townparks.	Kilbannon and Innishmacsaint
332	Teelin Estuary,	2 Ditto,	Mrs. Anne Hamilton,	Mrs. Anne Hamilton,	Kilcar and Glencolumbkill.	Glencolumbkill and Kilcar.
333	Sea off Coast co. Donegal,	1 Ditto,	Charles Stewart,	Charles Stewart,	Layatreany,	Clondahorty,
334	Sea off Coast co. Londonderry,	Ditto,	C. M'Kinney,	Mary Ross and E. Deane.	Doaghs,	Magilligan,
335	Ditto,	Ditto,	J. M'Gowney,	—	Lower and Middle Doaghs.	Ditto,
336	Ditto,	Ditto,	William Lorton,	William Lorton,	Ditto,	Ditto,
337	River Foyle,	8 Ditto,	The Irish Society,	The Irish Society,	Claughboy, Montgavillen, Ballydonaghy, Glenfad, Porthall, Culmore and Coolkeeragh.	Donagheady, Taughboyne, Leckpatrick, Clonleigh, Templemore, and Glandermott.
338	Ditto,	2 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Campsie & Coolattee,	Cappagh and Clonleigh.
339	River Bann,	4 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ballysally, E. & W. Crossreagh.	Coleraine, Killowen, Dumloe, & Ballyaghran.
340	Sea off Coast co. Derry,	1 Ditto,	Earl of Antrim,	Earl of Antrim,	Portrush,	Ballywillin,
341	River Blackwater,	Stake-Weir,	Hon. C. W. Moore Smyth.	Hon. C. W. Moore Smyth.	Ballynatray,	Templemichael.
342	Sea off Coast co. Antrim,	1 Fixed Draft Net.	R. Hector,	Sir H. H. Boyd,	Ballycastle, Townparks, Portbrittas.	Ramoan,
343	Ditto,	Stake-Weir,	Denis Black,	Denis Black,	Moneyvart,	Layd,
344	Shannon,	Stake-Net,	Stephen Colles,	Stephen Colles,	Lower Kilcolgan,	Kilnaughten,
345	Ditto,	2 Ditto,	Lord Annally,	Lord Annally,	Lakyle, North,	Kilofin,
346	Ditto,	Ditto,	Colonel Vandeleur,	Colonel Vandeleur,	Ballynote, West,	Kilrush,
347	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Carrodotia, South,	Kilimor,
348	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Colemanstown,	Kilofin,
349	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Lakyle, South,	Ditto,
350	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Carrodotia, West,	Kilimor,
351	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. H. Borough,	R. H. Borough,	Querin,	Kilofin,
352	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. W. C. Reeves,	R. W. C. Reeves	Poulnadaree,	Kilimor,
353	Ditto,	Ditto,	B. Cox,	B. Cox,	Clarefield,	Moyarta,
354	Ditto,	Ditto,	N. S. O'Gorman,	N. S. O'Gorman,	Ballynote, West,	Kilrush,

the Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland—*con.*

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Inspectors.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Inspectors Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
285	Lr. Glenarm,	Antrim,	See No. 299.	—	—	—
286	Ditto,	Ditto,	See No. 295.	—	—	—
287	Imokilly,	Cork,	Legal,	16 Feb. 1870.	—	—
288	Bantry,	Ditto,	Illegal, as erected without the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	21 Feb. „	—	—
289	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
290	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
291	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	Ditto.	—	—
292	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
293	Iraghticonnor,	Kerry,	Legal,	11 Mar. „	—	—
294	Cary,	Antrim,	Ditto,	10 May, „	—	—
295	Lr. Glenarm,	Ditto,	Ditto,	10 May, „	—	—
296	Cary,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
297	Lr. Glenarm,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
298	Cary,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
299	Lr. Glenarm,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
300	Cary,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
301	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
302	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
303	N.E. Liberties of Coleraine.	Londonderry,	Ditto,	11 May, „	—	—
304	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
305	Kenaght,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
306	Banagh,	Donegal,	Ditto,	13 May, „	—	—
307	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	Ditto.	—	—
308	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
309	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal. Injurious to navigation,	Ditto.	—	—
310	Kilmacrenan,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
311	Banagh,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	Ditto.	—	—
312	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
313	Tirhugh,	Ditto,	Illegal, as not having the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto.	—	—
314	Banagh,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
315	Tirhugh,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
316	Banagh,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
317	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
318	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
319	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal, as not having the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto.	—	—
320	—	Mayo and Sligo.	Legal,	17 May, „	Appeal pending.	—
321	Tireragh,	Sligo,	Ditto,	18 May, „	Ditto.	—
322	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn.	—	—	—
323	Erris,	Mayo,	Legal,	18 May, „	—	—
324	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
325	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Waterford,	No power to grant Certificate (see No. 341),	11 Jan. 1871.	Appeal.	Order against weir to be no bar to granting a certificate.
326	Iraghticonnor	Kerry,	Legal,	16 Jan. „	—	—
327	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
328	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
329	Tireragh,	Sligo,	Illegal, as not having the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	4 Feb. „	—	—
330	Erris,	Ditto,	Legal,	4 Feb. „	—	—
331	Tirhugh,	Donegal,	Ditto,	7 Feb. „	—	—
332	Banagh,	Ditto,	Illegal, as not having the title required by 5 & 6 Vic., c. 106.	Ditto.	—	—
333		Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
334	Keenagh,	Londonderry,	Ditto,	14 Feb. „	Appeal.	Judgment Affirmed.
335	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
336	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
337	Raphoe, Strabane, Lowest Liberties Londonderry, and Tir	Ditto, wer, Northof Londonkeeran.	Ditto,	15 Feb. „	—	—
338	Omagh, East, and Raphoe.	Londonderry and Donegal.	Illegal, not fished in 1862,	Ditto.	—	—
339	Ditto,	Londonderry,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
340	Lr. Dunluce,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
341	Coshmore & Coshbride.	Waterford,	Not injurious to navigation,	24 May, „	—	Certificate granted.
342	Carey,	Antrim,	Adjourned (see No. 378),	19 July, „	—	—
343	Lr. Glenarm,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
344	Kilcolgan, Lr.	Kerry,	Adjourned,	9 Nov. „	—	—
345	Clonderlaw,	Clare,	Legal,	10 Nov. „	—	—
346	Moyarta,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
347	Clonderlaw,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
348	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
349	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	11 Nov. „	—	—
350	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
351	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	Ditto.	—	—
352	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
353	Moyarta,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
354	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal, not fished in 1862,	Ditto.	—	—

APPENDIX, No. 26.

APPENDIX No. 26.—RESULT of INQUIRIES held by the INSPECTORS of IRISH FISHERIES into

No.	Where Fixed Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.	Name of Person maintaining and using Fixed Net.	Name of Owner of Fixed Net, or of Land to which Net attached.	Name of Townland to which Net attached.	Parish.
355	Sea off Coast co. Sligo,	3 Bag Nets,	W. Little,	R. Orme,	Carrowhubback, Sth.,	Kilglas,
356	Estuary of Drumcliffe River,	Fixed Draft Net	William Petrie,	J. Obins Jones,	Court and Drumcliffe,	Drumcliffe,
357	Sea off Coast co. Mayo,	2 Bag Nets,	W. Pike,	W. Pike,	Dooega,	Achill,
358	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Achill Beg,	Ditto,
359	Ditto,	4 Ditto,	Alexander Hector,	Trustees Achill Mission.	Slievemore,	Ditto,
360	— Ditto,	3 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Keel, East,	Ditto,
361	— Ditto,	3 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Doogort, West,	Ditto,
362	— Ditto,	2 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Doogort, East,	Ditto,
363	Ditto,	2 Ditto,	Ditto,	Sir F. A. Knox Gore, bart.	Cushlecka,	Ditto,
364	Ditto,	3 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Dooghbeg,	Ditto,
365	Kenmare Estuary,	Bag Net,	R. Mahony,	R. Mahony,	Doon,	Kilcrohane,
366	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Derreenafoyle,	Ditto,
367	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Dromore,	Templenoe,
368	Ditto,	Ditto,	F. C. Bland,	F. C. Bland,	Derryquin,	Kilcrohane,
369	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
370	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Marq. of Lansdowne,	Marq. of Lansdowne,	Camphia,	Tuosist,
371	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Clonee,	Ditto,
372	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ardea,	Ditto,
373	Sea off Coast co. Louth,	Ditto,	A. Newcomen,	A. Newcomen,	Clegher,	Termonfeckin,
374	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
375	— Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
376	Sea off Coast co. Antrim,	Fixed Draft Net	J. Finlay,	J. Finlay,	Sleans,	Layd,
377	Ditto,	Ditto,	R. Woodside,	R. Woodside,	Gregganboy,	Ramoan,
378	Ditto,	Ditto,	Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.	Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.	Ballycastle, Townparks, Port Brittas.	Ditto,
379	Sea off Coast co. Donegal,	4 Bag Nets,	Chas. F. Stewart,	Chas. F. Stewart,	Largatreany and Muntermellan.	Clondahorkey,
380	Ditto,	1 Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Largatreany,	Ditto,
381	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
382	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Muntermellan,	Ditto,
383	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
384	Sea off Coast co. Louth,	Ditto,	A. Newcomen,	A. Newcomen,	Clogher,	Termonfeckin,
385	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,
386	Cork Harbour,	Stake Net,	J. C. Bennett,	J. C. Bennett,	Ballymore,	Templerobin,

APPENDIX, No. 27.

Certificates for Fixed Engines.

APPENDIX,

CERTIFICATES granted up to 31st December, 1875, for Fixed

No.	Place.	Name of Person to whom Certificate granted.	Date of Certificate.	District in which Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.
1	Sea off co. Londonderry,	Henry O'Neill,	31 August, 1865,	Coleraine,	1 Bag Net,
2	Ditto, Antrim,	A. G. Fullerton,	5 September, 1865,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
3	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
4	Kenmare River,	E. B. Hartopp,	16 January, 1866,	Kenmare,	1 Ditto,
5	Sea off co. Antrim,	Thomas Black,	2 October, 1865,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
6	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
7	Ditto,	Sir E. MacNaghten,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
8	Ditto,	Thomas Black,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
9	Ditto,	Earl of Antrim,	22 November,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
10	Ditto,	Thomas Black,	2 October,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
11	Ditto,	Ditto,	21 October,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
12	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Coleraine,	1 Ditto,
13	Ditto, Louth,	Sir Alan E. Bellingham,	28 October,	Dundalk,	1 Head Weir,
14	Ditto, Antrim,	J. C. Anderson,	Ditto,	Ballycastle,	1 Bag Net,
15	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
16	Ballycotton Bay,	John Litton,	31 October,	Lismore,	1 Ditto,
17	River Shannon,	William B. Barrington,	7 November,	Limerick,	1 Fly Net,
18	Sea off co. Louth,	John F. Jones,	16 November,	Dundalk,	1 Bag Net,
19	Barrow, otherwise Suir, Nore, and Barrow conjoined.	Lord Templemore,	4 December,	Waterford,	1 Head Weir,
			1866.		
20	Lough Foyle,	The Irish Society,	2 January,	Londonderry,	1 Stake Net,
21	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
22	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
23	River Erne,	Alicia Sheil,	20 January,	Ballyshannon,	1 Ditto,
24	River Shannon,	S. Cunningham,	16 March,	Limerick,	1 Ditto,
			1867.		
25	River Bunratty,	Thomas Studdert,	11 February,	Limerick,	1 Head Weir,
26	Ringabella Bay,	Samuel Hodder,	7 March,	Cork,	1 Bag Net,
27	Sea off co. Sligo,	Ormsby Jones,	4 November,	Sligo,	1 Ditto,
			1868.		
28	River Blackwater,	John Neil and William Hennessy,	14 January,	Lismore,	1 Stake Net,
29	Sea off co. Sligo,	Lady Palmerston and Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple.	20 January,	Sligo,	1 Bag Net,
30	Sea off co. Donegal,	George Young,	27 April,	Londonderry,	1 Ditto,
31	Doonmore Strand,	John Scott,	19 May,	Limerick,	1 Salmon Weir or Wall.
32	Doonbeg Strand,	W. Staepoole,	19 May,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
33	Sea off co. Donegal,	George Young,	6 October,	Londonderry,	1 Bag Net,
34	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
			1870.		
35	Shannon,	William Creagh Hickie,	8 February,	Limerick,	1 Stake net,
36	Ditto,	Colonel C. M. Vandeleur,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
37	Clonderalaw Bay,	Lord Annaly,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,

the Legality or Illegality of Fixed Nets erected or used for catching Salmon in Ireland—*con.*

APPENDIX, No. 26.

No.	Barony.	County.	Judgment of Inspectors.	Date of Judgment.	Whether Judgment of Inspectors Appealed against.	Result of Appeal in Court of Queen's Bench.
355	Tireragh,	Sligo,	Report made to Court,	—	—	Judgment of Commissioners reversed.
356	Carbury,	Ditto,	Legal,	22Mar.1872.	—	—
357	Burrishoole,	Mayo,	Ditto,	16May,1872.	—	—
358	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal,	Ditto.	—	—
359	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
360	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
361	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	17May,1872.	—	—
362	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
363	Ditto,	Ditto,	One illegal, not fished in 1862, and one legal,	Ditto.	—	—
364	Ditto,	Ditto,	Two illegal, not fished in 1862, and one legal,	Ditto.	—	—
365	Dunkerron, South.	Kerry,	Withdrawn,	15June,1872.	—	—
366	Ditto,	Ditto,	Postponed,	Ditto.	—	—
367	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
368	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
369	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
370	Glenardough,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
371	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
372	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
373	Ferrard,	Louth,	Legal,	29 June, and 1st July. 1872.	—	—
374	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal,	Ditto,	Appeal pending.	—
375	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—
376	Lr. Glenarm,	Antrim,	Legal,	9 July, 1872.	—	—
377	Carey,	Ditto,	Ditto,	10July,1872.	—	—
378	Ditto,	Ditto,	Illegal—injurious to navigation,	Ditto,	Appeal pending.	—
379	Kilmacrenan.	Donegal,	Adjourned,	14 May, 1873.	—	—
380	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	19 June, „	—	—
381	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto.	—	—
382	Ditto,	Ditto,	Withdrawn,	Ditto.	—	—
383	Ditto,	Ditto,	Legal,	Ditto.	—	—
384	Ferrard,	Louth,	Report made to Court,	—	Appeal pending.	—
385	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	—	Ditto.	—
386	Barrymore,	Cork,	Illegal,	9 Mar., 1874.	Ditto.	—

No. 27.

Engines for fishing for Salmon or Trout.

APPENDIX, No. 27.

Certificates for fixed Engines.

Particulars of Size, &c.	Observations.
Net, 138 yards—first pole from shore, 12 yards; last do., 150 yards,	Ballygelagh net.
Leader, 72 yards; net, 20 yards,	Larrybane net.
Leader, 50 yards; net, 20 yards,	Carrickaraide net.
Leader, 240 feet; net, 54 feet,	Rath.
Leader, 600 feet; net, 66 feet,	Curran net.
Leader, 330 feet; net, 66 feet,	Big Duncan net.
Leader, 246 feet; net, 84 feet,	Portbradden net.
Leader, 330 feet; net, 66 feet,	Skerryvan net.
Leader, 150 feet; net, 48 feet,	Torr net.
Leader, 240 feet; net, 66 feet,	Little Duncan net.
Leader, 288 feet; net, 66 feet,	Portneen net.
Leader, 330 feet; net, 66 feet,	Flagstaff net.
South side, 627 feet; east side, 204½ feet; Fish Pass south side, 3½ feet; open at end in river, 4½ feet,	Castlebellingham weir.
Net, 316 feet; head, 63 feet,	Portfad net.
Ditto, ditto,	Portmoon net.
271 feet,	Ballycotton net.
Weir, 190 feet; H.W.M. to in-pole, 90 feet,	Shannon Lawn weir.
Leader, 360 feet; bag, 42 feet; first pole, 300 feet from fixed point on shore,	Draghenstown net.
Shore wing, 225 feet; channel wing, 94 feet; space between shore wing and rock, 45 feet,	Buttermilk Castle weir.
In-pole of Shore Leader to outer pole of same, 153 feet; out-pole of do. to do. of Ebb Leader, 82 feet; out-pole of chambers of net channelwards, 17 feet.	The Crook weir.
In-pole of Shore Leader to outer pole of same, 196 feet; out-pole of do. to do. of Flood Leader, 112 feet; out-pole of chambers of net channelwards, 22 feet.	The Shell Rock weir.
In-pole of Shore Leader to outer pole of same, 262 feet; out-pole of do. to do. of Flood Leader, 152 feet,	The Chapel Brook weir.
Land arm, 210 yards flood,	Erne weir.
Wing, 42 yards; ebb wing, 44 yards,	Aylerocbeg weir.
138 feet; 18 feet eye,	Bunratty weir.
Leader, 240 feet; length of net, 22 feet,	Ringabella net.
Leader, 110 yards; length of net, 20 yards,	Streedagh net.
185 feet, Leader,	Scart weir.
366 feet, inner to outer pole,	Mullaghmore net.
348 feet, inner to outer pole,	Claggan net.
660 feet,	Doonmore weir.
1,254 feet,	Doonbeg weir.
Leader, 270 feet; bag, 78 feet,	Bunnagee net.
Ditto, ditto,	Carrickafual net.
306 yards long,	Cloonaman weir.
The leader, 274 feet long; and head, 50 feet long and 19 feet wide,	Mount Shannon weir.
The first or shore leader 167 yards long; the head 20 yards long and 14½ yards wide. The second leader 136 yards long; and the second head 20 yards long and 14½ yards wide.	Millpark weir.

APPENDIX, No. 27.

Certificates for Fixed Engines.

APPENDIX,

CERTIFICATES granted up to 31st December, 1875, for Fixed

No.	Place.	Name of Person to whom Certificate granted.	Date of Certificate.	District in which Net situated.	Description of Fixed Net.
38	Clonderalaw Bay,	Lord Annaly,	8 February,	Limerick,	1 Stake net,
39	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
40	Ditto,	R. W. C. Reeves,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
41	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
42	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
43	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
44	Shannon,	Knight of Glin,	Ditto,	Ditto	1 Ditto,
45	Ditto,	C. H. Minchin,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
46	Waterford Harbour,	A. N. O'Neill,	Ditto,	Waterford,	1 Ditto,
47	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
48	Clonderalaw Bay,	Col. H. Hickman,	Ditto,	Limerick,	1 Ditto,
49	Shannon,	John Griffin,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
50	Carnlough Bay,	Earl of Antrim,	Ditto,	Ballycastle,	1 Bag net,
51	King's Channel,	A. N. O'Neill,	Ditto,	Waterford,	2 Stake nets,
52	Shannon,	Leslie Wren,	Ditto,	Limerick,	1 Ditto,
53	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
54	Ditto,	Baron Monteagle,	11 February,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
55	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
56	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
57	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
58	Ditto,	Thomas Sandes,	12 March,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
59	Off coast, co. Antrim,	Sir E. W. Macnaghten, bart.,	2 May,	Ballycastle,	1 Bag net,
60	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
61	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Fixed draft net,
62	Island of Achill,	Alexander Hector,	Ditto,	Bangor,	1 Bag net,
63	Magilligan Strand,	Sir H. H. Bruce, bart.,	Ditto,	Londonderry,	1 Ditto,
64	Sea off Coast of Sligo,	Rt. Hon. W. Cowper Temple,	Ditto,	Ballyshannon	1 Fixed draft net,
65	River Moy,	Mary Anne Litle and Andrew Clarke,	Ditto,	Ballina,	6 Ditto,
66	Ballycastle Bay,	Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.,	Ditto,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
67	Moy River,	J. W. Stratford,	18 May,	Ballina,	3 Ditto,
68	Owenmore River,	William Petrie,	Ditto,	Bangor,	1 Ditto,
69	Owenmore and Ballycroy Rivers,	Helen Little,	19 May,	Ditto,	7 Ditto,
*70	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	Denis Black,	11 May,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
71	Ditto,	John Finlay,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
72	Ditto,	John M'Gildowney,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
73	Ditto,	Edmund M'Neill,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
74	Red Bay,	H. H. M'Neill,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
75	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	Earl of Antrim,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
76	Sea off coast, co. Londonderry,	Alexander Shuldham, A. W. White, and R. J. Broughton.	Ditto,	Londonderry,	4 Ditto,
77	Sea off coast, co. Londonderry,	John Cromie,	Ditto,	Ditto,	3 Ditto,
78	Sea off coast, co. Donegal,	H. G. Murray Stewart,	13 May,	Ballyshannon,	2 Ditto,
79	Inver Bay,	William Sinclair,	Ditto,	Ditto,	2 Ditto,
80	Sea off coast, co. Donegal,	Marquis Conyngham,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
81	River Leenane (Estuary),	Sir J. Stewart, bart.,	Ditto,	Letterkenny,	1 Ditto,
82	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	Lady Boyd, on behalf of Sir H. H. Boyd, bart.	11 May,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
			1870.		
83	Sea off coast, co. Donegal,	Ebenezer Bustard,	13 May,	Ballyshannon,	1 Fixed draft net,
84	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	J. E. Leslie,	11 May,	Ballycastle,	1 Ditto,
85	Sea off coast, co. Mayo,	William Little,	8 June,	Ballina,	2 Bag nets,
86	Cork Harbour,	Sampson French,	22 September,	Cork,	1 Stake net,
			1871.		
87	Shannon,	Rob t Leslie,	16 January,	Limerick,	1 Stake net,
88	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
89	Ditto,	Thomas Sandes,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
90	River Erne,	R. L. Moore and others,	7 February,	Ballyshannon,	3 Fixed draft nets,
91	Sligo River,	Abraham Martin,	20 February,	Sligo,	2 Fixed draft nets,
92	Magilligan Strand,	Sir H. Bruce, bart.,	22 April,	Londonderry,	1 Fixed draft net,
93	Bann River,	The Irish Society,	15 February,	Coleraine,	4 Fixed draft nets,
94	Magilligan Strand,	James M'Gowery,	Ditto,	Londonderry,	1 Fixed draft net,
95	Ditto,	William Lorton,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
96	River Foyle,	The Irish Society,	Ditto,	Ditto,	8 Fixed draft nets,
97	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	Earl of Antrim,	29 April,	Ballycastle,	1 Fixed draft net,
98	River Blackwater,	Trustees, Provincial Bank,	15 February, 1872,	Lismore,	1 Stake Weir,
99	Ditto,	Hon. C. W. Moore Smyth,	21 June, 1871,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
100	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	Denis Black,	19 July,	Ballycastle,	1 Fixed draft net,
101	Shannon,	Lord Annally,	10 November,	Limerick,	1 Stake net,
102	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
103	Ditto,	R. W. C. Reeves,	11 November,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
104	Ditto,	Colonel Vandeleur,	10 November,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
105	Ditto,	Ditto,	11 November,	Ditto,	2 Stake Nets,
106	Ditto,	Ditto,	10 November,	Ditto,	1 Stake Net,
107	Ditto,	Benjamin Cox,	11 November,	Ditto,	1 Ditto,
			1872.		
108	Drumcliffe River,	William Petrie,	12 April,	Sligo,	1 Fixed draft net,
109	Sea off coast, co. Sligo,	William Little,	16 May,	Ballina,	3 Bag nets,
110	Sea off coast, co. Mayo,	Sir F. A. K. Gore, bart.,	25 May,	Bangor,	2 Ditto,
111	Ditto,	William Pike,	1 July,	Ditto,	2 Ditto,
112	Ditto,	Trustees Achill Mission,	Ditto,	Ditto,	4 Ditto,
113	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	5 Ditto,
114	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	Ditto,	3 Ditto,
115	Sea off coast, co. Louth,	Arthur Newcomen	10 July,	Dundalk,	1 Bag net,
116	Sea off coast, co. Antrim,	John Finlay,	9 July,	Ballycastle,	1 Fixed draft net,
117	Ditto,	Robert Woodside,	10 July,	Ditto,	1 Bag net,
			1873.		
118	Sea off coast, co. Donegal,	Charles F. Stewart,	19 June,	Letterkenny,	3 Ditto,

* This certificate was withdrawn, and certificate 100 issued to Denis Black, instead of the one withdrawn.

No. 27—*continued.*

Engines for fishing for Salmon or Trout—*continued.*

Particulars of Size, &c.	Observations.
The first or shore leader, 154 yards long; first head, 20 yards long and 14½ yards wide. The second leader, 130 yards long; second head, 20 yards long and 14½ yards wide.	Lacknabahee weir.
The leader 120 yards long, and the head 20 yards long by 14½ yards wide,	Lakyle weir.
The leader 60 yards long, and the head 26 yards long and 7 yards wide,	Lynch's Point weir.
The leader 115 yards long, and the head 28 yards long and 12 yards wide,	Park Ruagh weir.
The leader 78 yards long, and the head 28 yards long and 9 yards wide,	Poulnagulky weir.
The leader 80 yards long, and the head 28 yards long and 11 yards wide,	Woodpoint weir.
The first leader 492 feet long; first head 45½ feet. Second leader, 224 feet long; second head, 73½ feet. Third leader, 242 feet long; third head, 72 feet; and the fourth leader, 272½ feet long; fourth head, 73 feet.	Long Rock weir.
Leader, 49½ yards long; and head, 32 yards long,	Killacolla weir.
The first leader, 383 yards long; and the second leader, 436 yards 1 foot long,	Knockavelish weir.
The first leader, 552 yards long; second leader, 398 yards 1 foot long,	Woodstown weir.
The first leader, 169 yards long; first head, 14 yards long. Second leader, 111 yards long; second head, 3½ yards long.	Kilmore Point weir.
The first leader, 332 feet long; first head, 39 feet long and 15 feet wide. Second leader, 233 feet long; second head, 73 feet long and 16½ feet wide. Third leader, 183 feet long; head, 97 feet long and 17 feet wide.	Carrowbanebeg weir.
Leader, 115 yards long; head 43 feet long,	Carnlough net.
Lower weir—leader, 88 yards long; upper weir—leader, 33 yards long. The head or pocket of the former extending from west to east 34 yards in breadth, and the latter extending from west to east 52 yards.	King's Channel weirs (2).
Entire length, 324 yards,	Carrigane weir.
Entire length, 167 yards,	Kylatallin weir.
Leader, 200 feet long; head, 84 feet long,	Foyne's Island (south) weir.
Leader, 187 feet long; head, 80 feet long, and 18 feet 6 inches wide,	Foyne's Island (north) weir.
The first leader, 398 feet long; first head 103 feet long and 14 feet wide. Second leader, 235 feet long; second head, 96 feet long and 19 feet wide.	Durnish weir.
The first leader, 300 feet long; first head, 40 feet long and 33 feet wide. Second leader, 210 feet long; second head, 93 feet long, 18 feet wide.	Mount Trenchard weir.
Size—327 feet from high-water mark,	Coolnanoonagh weir.
Leader, 95 yards long; head, 21 yards long,	Blackrock bag net.
Leader, 74 yards long; head, 21 yards long,	Glashan Island bag net.
Length, 100 yards,	Cregganeagh net.
Leader, 150 yards long; head, 18 yards long,	Keel net.
Leader, 315 yards long; head, 17 yards long,	Ballymaclary net.
Length, 120 yards long,	Mullaghmore net.
6 nets, from 150 to 250 yards in length,	—
Length, 100 yards,	Ballycastle net.
3 nets, not exceeding 80 yards in length,	Scurmore fixed nets.
Ditto, 120 ditto,	Owenmore nets.
7 Ditto, 300 ditto,	Tullaghan nets.
Length, 300 feet,	Moneyvart fixed draft net.
Length, 80 yards,	Ballyteerim fixed net.
Length, 104 yards,	Clarepark fixed net.
Length, 90 yards,	Currysheskin fixed net.
Length, 116 yards,	Red Bay fixed draft net.
Length, 100 yards,	Layd fixed draft net.
2—320 yards in length; and 2—140 yards in length,	Crossreagh and Tullaghnurney nets.
2 nets, 150 yards long; and 1—122 yards long,	Mullaghacall nets.
2 nets, not exceeding 250 yards in length,	Muckross & Gortalia nets.
2 nets, 140 yards long,	Inver nets.
Length, 130 yards,	Ballyederlane net.
Length, 120 yards,	Leenane net.
Length, 90 yards,	Kinbane net.
Length, 90 yards,	Drumbanan net.
Length, 75 yards,	Templastragh net.
Leaders, 50 fathoms long each; and each bag about 7 feet wide,	Kilcummin bag nets.
Length, 60 yards,	Cuskinny net.
Length, 117 yards,	Tarbert net.
Length, 67 yards,	Kilpadogue net.
Length, 32 yards 2 feet,	Ralapane net.
Each 200 yards long,	—
Each not exceeding 135 yards length,	—
Not exceeding 240 yards length,	—
Not exceeding 240 yards length,	—
160 yards long,	—
150 yards long,	—
From 100 to 200 yards long,	—
120 yards long,	Pier net.
Length of Shore-arm, 70 feet; body of Weir, 83 feet; Flood-arm, 15 feet; large yard, width, 18 feet; Fish pocket, width, 17 feet.	Stael weir.
Leader, 94 feet long; head, 108 feet—Ballinatroy Weir,	Ballynatray weir.
Length, 100 yards,	Moneyvart, otherwise Portvinegar, draft net.
Leader, 110 yards long,	River weir.
Leader, 70 yards long,	Ballery weir.
Leader, 103 yards long; head, 26 yards, and 8 wide,	Poulnadarree weir.
Leader, 69 yards long; head, 7 yards long,	Ayelvarroo or Ballynote west weir.
E. Weir, leader, 78 yards long; head, 17 yards—W. Weir leader, 95 yards long; 3 heads each, 17 yards long.	Carrowdotia eastern and western weirs.
Leader, 90 yards long; head, 17 yards long,	Colmanstown weir.
5 leaders, each 120 yards, and 5 heads, each 17 yards long,	Clarefield weir.
150 yards in length,	Drumcliffe net.
Leaders, each 50 fathoms long; heads, 6 fathoms each,	Enniscrone nets.
Leaders, 40 fathoms long; heads, 5 fathoms long,	Cushlecka and Dooghbeg nets.
Leaders, 40 fathoms long, and heads 5 fathoms long,	Dooega nets.
Leaders, 40 fathoms; heads, 5 fathoms long,	Slievemore nets.
Leaders, 40 fathoms long; head, 5 fathoms long,	Doogort nets.
Ditto, ditto,	Keel nets.
Leader, 50 fathoms long; head, 9 fathoms,	St. Dennis's Well net.
43 fathoms long,	Sleans net.
Leader, 74 yards long; head, 76 yards,	Cregganboy net.
Leaders not exceeding 80 yards each in length, and the heads 24 yards in length and 10 yards in width.	Horn Head nets.

DUBLIN: PRINTED BY ALEXANDER THOM, 87 & 88, ABBEY-STREET,
PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

REPORT

BY THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE FISHERY BOARD: SCOTLAND:

OF THEIR PROCEEDINGS

IN THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER 1875.

BEING FOR FISHING 1875.

Presented in pursuance of the Acts 48 Geo. III. c. 110, sect. 7, and 55 Geo. III. c. 94, sect. 4.

THE Herring Fishery of 1875 yielded the following Returns :—

Barrels Cured.	Barrels Exported.	Barrels Branded.	Brand Fees.
942,980.	660,970½	523,789½	£8,729 16*s.* 6*d.*

The Fishing proved abundant ; indeed it was more abundant than that of any previous year, with the single exception of the fishing immediately preceding, viz., that of 1874. In no year have so many barrels of herrings been branded as in 1875, which makes this part of the returns and the year's collection of brand fees the largest on record.

The number of Barrels Branded year by year since the institution of brand fees in 1859, and the relative collection of fees, have been as follows, the total sum collected being £88,055, 2*s.* 10d. :—

Year.	Barrels Branded.	Fees Collected.
1859	158,676	£2,644 12 0
1860	231,913½	3,865 4 6
1861	265,347	4,422 9 0
1862	346,712	5,778 10 8
1863	276,880½	4,614 13 6
1864	217,392	3,623 4 0
1865	216,785	3,613 1 8
1866	249,510	4,158 10 0
1867	317,421	5,290 7 0
1868	209,462½	3,491 0 10
1869	244,522½	4,075 7 6
1870	299,381½	4,989 13 10
1871	346,633½	5,777 4 6
1872	422,731½	7,045 10 6
1873	435,274½	7,254 11 6
1874	517,558½	8,625 19 6
1875	523,789½	8,729 16 6
	5,279,991	£87,999 17 0
Bank Interest upon the 17 years' collections,		55 5 10
	TOTAL,	£88,055 2 10

The herrings of the year were a good deal mixed as there were several maties among them, *i.e.* herrings of comparatively small size not fully developed, yet these were not so numerous in 1875 as they had been in 1874. With respect to the export trade the markets on the Continent were for a part of the season of 1875 very dull. In dull markets such disputes are apt to arise between buyers and sellers as seldom take place when markets are brisk. Some of these took the form of complaint that the herrings were too small and that they had not attained to full fish, the question what constitutes a *full* herring being one much mooted and often brought under discussion. It happened

[C.—1541. Price 4d.]

Fishery Board—875—June 1876.

that the Board had an opportunity of examining a parcel of herrings branded *full* for the Continent which had not given satisfaction to the purchasers, who courteously supplied every facility for the parcel being examined. By order of the Board a rigid examination was made and the herrings proved to be perfectly entitled to the brand they had received. It is right that it be understood that while the Board are, as they have always been, strict and vigilant in their efforts to uphold the reputation of the brand and the high quality of fish and cure it represents, they must decline to recognise any obligation to introduce such over-refinement of selection as would exclude herrings from ranking as first class when they are up to that standard, merely because other herrings may chance to surpass them and be in some points superior. It is not pretended that all ships classed A1 are of equal excellence either in material or workmanship, neither can all herrings branded be classed as equally good, but it is the study of the Board to secure that both as respects selection and cure, herrings in order to be branded should reach a high standard, although, as in the instance referred to, the standard may not altogether come up to the anticipation of the purchaser; and when complaints have been received the branding officers have been informed of them and put in communication with the curers so as still further to strengthen the precautions taken in the process of cure and insure the removal of every reasonable ground for remonstrance. The standard size of barrel has also been an object of very careful attention on the part of the Board, and has generally been maintained without having recourse to the power vested in the Board of making seizures and imposing fines; but in the course of this year it became necessary to resort both to seizure and fine in a case of a considerable number of barrels of herrings found of under-size.

The fishing began, as usual, in the district of Stornoway upon the west coast. This district comprises from Butt of Lewis on the north to Barra Head on the south, the southern portion being known as Loch Boisdale section, where during the time of the fishing a separate fishery officer is stationed. The fishing throughout the district of Stornoway proved very unsuccessful, and in Loch Boisdale section was nearly a failure. The chief cause to which this is attributed was the very unfavourable weather which prevailed. As this fishing lasts but a short time, favourable weather is of essential consequence to its success; but in 1875 adverse weather wholly prevented the boats from going out on several nights, and often when they were out they were obliged, after setting their nets, to haul them again and run to the land for shelter, so heavy and continuous were the gales of wind. In the northern portion of the district, about Stornoway and its vicinity, another drawback to the fishing was, that dog-fish ravaged the shoals of herrings, and did so much damage to nets that at many of the stations the fishermen were compelled to remain on shore for several nights in succession. This did not occur in Loch Boisdale section of the district, and hence it is supposed that the herrings never settled down upon the fishing grounds about Loch Boisdale as they had done in some former years, which is further confirmed by the fact that even when the weather was favourable the catch was scanty. The general result in the district of Stornoway has been a decrease of 23,761 barrels of herrings in the cure of 1875 from that of the preceding year. Soon after the Stornoway fishing had set in, the fishing for the season began to be prosecuted in earnest in the districts of Campbeltown and Inverary. In Campbeltown district it proved an inferior fishing to that of 1873 and of 1874, both of which, however, were in this district extraordinary fishings; but it yielded considerably above the average of the ten years preceding 1873. Here, as in Stornoway district, unfavourable weather marred the prospects of the fishermen and kept down the returns of catch. The fishing for most of the season was prosecuted pretty equally with drift nets and seine or trawl nets, but in the months of November and December seine nets were used exclusively, and were even used successfully in deep water at a distance of from five to eight miles off the shore: of the catch, a larger proportion was taken by the seine than by the drift net. In Inverary district the catch of the year exceeded that of 1874, the returns of this district for 1875 showing an increase in cure of 7662 barrels of herrings over the returns of 1874, or a cure in 1875 more than double that of 1874. The herrings failed to pass up to the higher parts of Loch Fyne although about the end of July there was great abundance of small-sized herrings between Otter and Minard, and nowhere above Ardrishaig was there anything but a poor and irregular fishing, the upper parts of the loch being almost blank. But about Tarbert, at the entrance of the loch, the case was different; here there was an excellent fishing, especially with the seine net, and the herrings thus caught were of fine quality and large size, and, being larger than those in the drift nets, brought a better price: in the month of June eight seining fishermen from Tarbert earned in one week £325, in July another seining party enclosed nearly 300 crans of herrings in their net, and on the 13th and 27th of July the take at Tarbert was so abundant that more herrings were landed on those two days

than have been remembered to have been landed there on any two days in any former year. During the month of August the fishing was still successfully carried on, it declined very much in September, revived a little in October, then fell away and closed about the middle of December. Towards the end of July and throughout August and September the drift nets did better than the seines, and it was considered by those on the spot that about Tarbert there was not much difference in the earnings of the year between the drift net fishermen and the seiners. In Fort William district the catch, although not great, showed a better fishing than has occurred since the year 1869 and was more equally distributed, for in 1869 it was confined to one or two lochs and it has seldom been general in this district; but in 1875 the herrings were well spread and were found in lochs which had not been visited by them for the last thirty years, a great advantage to the local fishermen. In Loch Carron district the fishing in Loch Hourn, which for two or three previous years had been abundant and had collected a large number of boats to it, fell this year to an ordinary fishing, causing much disappointment as many fishermen from a distance had come to it from both coasts of Scotland; still some were fortunate enough to get a few good takes. In Loch Broom district there was no revival at any period of the year of that great herring fishery which has occasionally been seen there; and in the other districts of the west coast such variations as took place call for no special comment. The total decrease of the year upon the west coast was 32,768 barrels of herrings.

In further relation to the west coast herring fishery, it was stated in last year's Report—

that the fishing in Loch Fyne having been for some years very unproductive, the Marquis of Lorne, M.P. for the county of Argyll, Charles Dalrymple, Esq., M.P. for the county of Bute, and Sir William J. M. Cuninghame, Bart., M.P. for the Ayr Burghs, had undertaken an inquiry with a view to ascertain, if possible, what had occasioned the falling off of this fishing, and that, having visited the different localities and collected the opinions of fishermen and others, it was understood that they had made a report to the Government upon this question, which is one of much interest but of great difficulty.

Their report, thus referred to, was addressed to the Lord Advocate of Scotland, and was as follows:—

May 10th, 1875.

My Lord,—Having attended during last autumn many meetings of the fishermen of Loch Fyne district to inquire into the causes of the failure of the Herring Fishery, we beg to lay before you the opinions we have been able to form, and some recommendations we wish to make.

It appears that the fishing has been much less productive than formerly, and the prevailing opinion amongst those who use the drift net is that the system of trawling is the cause of the failure; on the other hand, the counter-statement is made with equal confidence that the drift net causes as much disturbance of the shoals as the trawl net, and that the failure of the fishery, which is not denied, must be attributed to other causes.

We examined these antagonistic opinions with great care, and by the light of all the information we could collect, and we are not satisfied that the trawl net, though possibly in some cases a destructive and wasteful engine of fishing, is the cause of the evil. The fact cannot be explained away that the fish seem to be at present disinclined to enter other narrow waters where trawling is unknown.

Other theories have been suggested to us,—such as, that the temperature of the air or water or the amount of rainfall may have affected the fish injuriously, or that the natural food of the herrings may have failed from natural causes,—for which theories, however, the evidence is very slight.

On the whole, we are inclined to the opinion that the fishing has been carried on to too great an extent in the narrow waters, and we recommend that steps be taken to restrict it to a certain extent.

There is evidence to show that the law which prescribes an annual close-time from 1st February to 1st June has not always been observed, and we recommend that the attention of the officer commanding Her Majesty's Fishery vessel be officially called to this point. Further, although it is the usual custom of the fishermen to keep the weekly close-time of twenty-four hours, it seems to us desirable that it should be extended, and we recommend that *north of a line drawn from the Mull of Galloway to the Mull of Kintyre*, it begin at Six P.M. Saturday, to last till Twelve midnight Sunday. The enforcement of such a regulation would be in accordance with the feelings and practice of the fishermen.

We recommend attention to the size of the mesh of the herring nets, which are often, we are informed, below the legal size, so as to cause the capture of immature fish.

We also recommend that the old regulation against daylight fishing be renewed and enforced.

We have the honour to be, your most obedient servants,

(Signed) LORNE.
CHARLES DALRYMPLE.
W. J. M. CUNINGHAME.

The Right Hon. the Lord Advocate.

This report his Lordship remitted to the Fishery Board by the following letter :—

1 New Street, Spring Gardens,
London, *5th June* 1875.

Sir,—I send you herewith a report which I have received from the Marquis of Lorne, Mr. Charles Dalrymple, and Sir William J. M. Cuninghame in regard to the Herring Fishery in Loch Fyne, which I have to request that you will lay before the Fishery Board for their consideration.

I am also to request that they will favour me with any observations which they may have to make on the subject.—I am, etc.

(Signed) EDWARD S. GORDON.

The Honble. Bouverie Primrose,
Board of Fisheries, Edinburgh.

The Fishery Board, having taken the report into consideration, transmitted to his Lordship the following remarks upon it :—

Lochfyne Herring Fishery and its Committee of Inquiry.

Remarks by the Fishery Board: Scotland: on the Committee's Report and Recommendations.

I.—Herring Close Time.

A Close Time for Herrings was first established by the Act 23 and 24 Vict. cap. 92 (1860), which Act fixed not merely the limits and period of Close Time but the mode by which offences against it were to be repressed and proceedings taken for their repression. The provisions of this Act were rendered still more stringent and effective by a subsequent Act, the 24 and 25 Vict. cap. 72 (1861).

But these two Acts have been repealed directly and indirectly. The Close Time established by the 23d and 24th Vict. cap. 92 (1860) was repealed directly by the 28th and 29th Vict. cap. 22 (1865), and indirectly by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868 (31st and 32d Vict. cap. 45). The Act 28th and 29th Vict. cap. 22 (1865) (an Act not brought in by the Fishery Board), in repealing the Herring Close Time of 1860, fixed new limits and a different period for the Close Time, but by its mode of repeal it abolished the proceedings by which offences against Close Time could be repressed, and substituted no others in their stead. With this repeal, the provisions of the 24th and 25th Vict. (1861), by which Close Time had been made really effective, also lapsed; hence there are no means now left for proceeding against offences, as through the omissions of the repealing Act the Superintendents at Sea cannot seize nets found in use during Close Time, nor can offenders be prosecuted for penalties. Suspension of compulsory observance of the Act has therefore become unavoidable.

The indirect repeal of Herring Close Time by the Sea Fisheries Act (1868) arises from that provision of the Act which declares that 'Herring fishing is free all the year round.' It was understood by the Board of Trade, which framed this Act, that Herring Close Time was abolished by it, and it was certainly the desire and intention of the Board of Trade that Herring Close Time should be abolished; but the fact of its complete abolition by the Act is disputed. There is no doubt, however, that whatever remains of Herring Close Time is restricted by the Act of 1868 to the limits within the three mile boundary from the shore, and thus another difficulty is created as to touching nets with a view to seizure, or in taking steps to proceed against offences, viz., that the intention of the fishermen may be to fish outside the three mile boundary which is legal, and that, to constitute an offence, proof must be adduced that they were fishing within the boundary. There is no longer the simple position of the original Close Time, that no Herring fishing whatever was permitted within its limits and period.

When Herring Close Time was kept so stringently as it was under the Acts of 1860 and 1861, it was found oppressive upon fishermen and injurious to other fishings. Great complaints were made that it interfered with the capture of herrings for bait for cod and other white fish; in some places it reduced the fishing population to starvation, and produced urgent appeals to the Board for relaxation. The Royal Commission of 1862 upon Herring Trawling on the coasts of Scotland had Herring Close Time under examination, and condemned it in principle. With reluctance they left it around the Firth of Clyde, reporting upon it in these words:—

"Although we have been unable to satisfy ourselves that a Close Time is of any advantage for "the protection of the herring, still, as it is universally approved of in the district around the Firth "of Clyde, we do not take upon ourselves to recommend, against the wish of those who are practically "concerned in the fisheries, any alteration as regards this district. It is true that Close Time presses "heavily on the long-line fishermen, who are unable to obtain herring for bait to catch white fish "during the Close Time, from the 1st January to the 31st May; but it would be possible in this "locality to allow licensed boats to catch fish for bait; and the general desire of all witnesses ex-"amined by us is, that the Board of Fishery should be allowed to license such boats under proper "regulations. We make this suggestion, however, purely in deference to the state of public feeling

" in the district in question. The establishment of any system of licensing boats for the capture of " bait would, in the long-run, involve the taxation of the community for the support of the officers " by whom this fishery is superintended, and a further tax on the long-line fishermen, who could " obtain their bait more cheaply if they were allowed to procure it for themselves. We do not " pretend that it is strictly justifiable to tax the community in general, or one particular branch of " industry to foster another; but in the prevalent state of public feeling about the Firth of Clyde, " the method proposed is the only practicable means of alleviating the injustice of Close Time, as " regards the persons engaged in the long-line fisheries.

" We are of opinion that there is not the slightest necessity for retaining a Close Time in any " part of the Coast north-west of the Mull of Cantyre."

The Royal Commission of 1863 upon the Sea Fisheries of Great Britain and Ireland entered into a wider examination of the subject, which they discuss at page 66 of their Report, where they condemn it in all its bearings; and at page 103 they summarize their opinion by stating that they regard Herring Close Time "to be as useless for its professed object as it has been oppressive in its " practical working."

By existing Acts Herring Close Time cannot be enforced, and it would be in the face of such opinions as these that, if it is to be re-established, Parliament must be invited to legislate for it.

II.—Weekly Close Time.

The Committee recommend that there should be no Herring Fishing between Six o'clock of Saturday night and midnight of Sunday. There is at present no Herring Fishing between midnight of Saturday and midnight of Sunday, but the recommendation proposes six hours of additional restriction on Saturday night, when, as there are no markets on Sunday morning, there is now scarcely any Herring Fishing, the fishermen generally using Saturday to dry and repair their nets and overhaul their fishing gear. It is difficult to see that Legislation is called for to prohibit a practice which scarcely exists, nor that it is requisite to introduce a restriction which might, under exceptional circumstances, prove a great hardship. Thus, for instance, if the fishermen had been kept idle at home during the week by bad weather and a succession of gales, and if these obstacles to fishing happened to cease at the end of the week, and shoals of herrings were seen close at hand on the Saturday night, it would be cruel to stop the fishermen from fishing, and the sentiments of public opinion are roused against the law: in such a state of matters its enforcement becomes impracticable, as was the case with Herring Close Time in 1864, when the Home Office were appealed to in order to alleviate the distress which Close Time was producing. Tested thus by a really abundant catch which has to be permitted while petty insignificant takes are suppressed, the law emerges in a failure if not an absurdity.

III.—Small Mesh Nets.

The Committee draw attention to the Mesh of the Herring Nets being often below the legal size, so as to cause the capture of immature fish. What is thus called the legal size is one inch from knot to knot; but by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, the obligation for this mesh is confined to fishing for herrings within the three-mile boundary; therefore, any fisherman may ship in his boat nets of any size of mesh without being liable to be interfered with, as it is not compulsory upon him to declare beforehand where he is going to fish. The repression of small-meshed nets within the boundary becomes in consequence very difficult, and the difficulty is increased by the necessity under which the fishermen are placed of seeking the herrings where they are to be found, and of following them wherever they go. For fishermen to be obliged to keep in stock an immense quantity of netting of different size of mesh according as they fish inside or outside of the boundary, is to subject them to a heavy expense and a teasing complexity in their preparations for fishing; but that they should be obliged besides this to stop fishing if they should come within the boundary with nets of the wrong size of mesh in their boats, or else proceed home, land the nets, and ship others of the proper size in their stead, is to hamper the Herring Fishery with such artificial and embarrassing restraints as are more likely to crush the industry of those engaged in it than keep alive in them the spirit of enterprise and adventure.

IV.—Daylight Fishing.

The last recommendation of the Committee is, that the old regulation against daylight fishing may be renewed and enforced.

This was not a regulation, but rather a custom. It was recognised as a custom in the 87th Article of the 6th and 7th Vict. cap. 79, which was the Act of 1843 for a fishery convention with France, and appears to have been introduced there to prevent French or English fishermen from bringing on brawls by disregarding a custom of fishing observed in certain localities. This Act of Parliament, being one of convention with a foreign Power, was not a general Act for the fisheries of Great Britain and Ireland; but even if it had been, it has been repealed by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, in which no such provision or recognition of the custom exists. Daylight fishing in general takes place only when herrings are on fishing grounds not far from the shore, and sometimes makes a considerable and valuable addition to the catch of the season. Before daylight fishing can be interfered with, a point on which different opinions are entertained, authority must be obtained from Parliament for the interference.

As a general remark upon the recommendations proposed by the Committee, the Board of Trade, which undertook the passing of the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, and obtained a large control

over the Fisheries of the United Kingdom by that Act, would have to consider and give their assent to the recommendations before they were presented to Parliament for legislation, inasmuch as they appear to be opposed to the principles of the Act, and to the evidence and arguments of the Sea Fisheries Commission which produced it. The Commission state, with reference to regulations which interfere with modes and times of fishing, "that they are frequently impracticable, and would be "injurious if put in practice;" and they emphatically advise—"that all Acts of Parliament which "profess to regulate or restrict the modes of fishing pursued in the open sea be repealed, and that "unrestricted freedom of fishing be permitted hereafter."

With respect to restrictive measures, it has further to be observed that they can only be carried into effect at great increase of expense. Admiralty cruisers cannot carry them out without the co-operation on shore of police in special pay of the Government, and with considerable outlay in legal proceedings and prosecutions.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary*.

FISHERY BOARD: SCOTLAND:
EDINBURGH, 16*th June* 1875.

These Remarks were issued to the Committee for publication, under the following instructions from the Lord Advocate:—

AHERNACH, GRANTOWN, 16*th Sept.* 1875.

SIR,—I have to request that the Fishery Board will furnish a copy of their Remarks on the Report of the Loch Fyne Herring Fishery Committee to Sir William Cuninghame, Bart., M.P., Glenmoor, Maybole, with permission to publish the same in such newspapers as may be selected by Lord Lorne, Sir William Cuninghame, and Mr. Charles Dalrymple, M.P., the members of the Committee.—I am, etc.,

(Signed) EDWARD S. GORDON.

Hon. B. F. PRIMROSE,
Secretary, Fishery Board for Scotland.

and upon this authority the Remarks were published by the Committee accordingly.

Upon the east coast, Fraserburgh and Peterhead were again the best fished districts of the year and showed fishings of great magnitude and importance. In Fraserburgh district, although the increase had in the preceding year been to the large amount of 36,653 barrels of herrings, there was a further increase in 1875 of no less than 31,154 barrels, the fishing having risen from 253,130 barrels in 1874 to 284,284 barrels in 1875. Peterhead district did not maintain the increase it had in 1874, as its returns for 1875 show a decrease of 14,553 barrels, the returns being 205,305 barrels in 1875 against 219,858 barrels in 1874; and Montrose district shows a decrease of 9,869 barrels: but Buckie district an increase of 2,093 barrels and Findhorn district an increase of 2,371 barrels; Wick district shows the somewhat larger increase of 2,512 barrels and Shetland an increase of 1,716 barrels: all the other east coast districts show more or less of a decrease, the decrease in some being considerable, as in Eyemouth district where the decrease amounted to 9,316 barrels and in Orkney to 10,061 barrels. The total decrease of the year upon the east coast was 24,812 barrels.

The fluctuations thus referred to, occurring alike in the open sea as within lochs and upon the east coast as well as upon the west coast, show the uncertainty which prevails in the herring fishery of Scotland. In this there is nothing extraordinary, as equal uncertainty is experienced in the herring fisheries of England and Ireland and elsewhere: in Newfoundland, herrings are found to desert the bays where at one time they abounded and to take to others which they had been scarcely known to enter before; and upon the herring fishery of Norway the following remarks appeared in the *Nautical Magazine*.

"The coasts of Norway have long been famous for their fisheries, which have always proved a "source of wealth to the Norwegians, who derive from this pursuit one of the main branches of their "commerce. The number of persons and vessels engaged show that it is a profitable and important "maritime occupation. To Vice-Consul Crowe we are indebted for a lengthened account, both com- "parative and otherwise, of the fisheries for the year 1874, with an interesting description of the novel "uses to which certain portions of the food thus obtained have been applied. The spring herring "fishery, with the exception of that in 1871, when there was an extraordinary rich catch, especially "in the Sondmöre district, has in the course of the last five years steadily decreased, so much so, "that the produce of 1874 did not reach to one-thirtieth of the average quantity for the years 1851 "to 1865, from which it is to be presumed that the present herring period, which began in 1808, "is at an end, or, at all events, very nearly so. The real cause of this decline has yet to be dis- "covered; probably it will be found to be connected with some submarine agency, such as the abun- "dance or scarcity of food, or the storms or currents affecting the temperature of the ocean. This is, "however, not the first time that the spring herring fishery has been known to desert the coast even for "long periods. The details respecting this fishery in early times are naturally most uncertain and "insufficient but within the three last centuries the records have been more accurate, and from these "we find that this fishery totally disappeared during the first half of the seventeenth century, and "that, in the years 1650 to 1654, only 8,000 barrels were annually exported. In 1661 and 1662 the

"fishery seems to have been good, but not extraordinary; and so it continued for the latter half of the "century. From 1700 to 1784 the spring herrings visited the coast regularly, especially between "Stavanger and Bergen, and during the last ten years of the period they were unusually plentiful "near Stavanger. From 1736 to 1756 the fishery continued good in the Romsdal districts, but in "Sondmöre it ceased altogether in the year 1758, but was replaced by a most profitable cod fishery. "From 1785 the spring herring is said to have entirely deserted the coast, not making its appearance "again till 1808."

The Meteorological Society of Scotland have for two or three years had this capriciousness in the movements of the Herring under special investigation, and in the past year the deep-sea thermometers provided to the Society by the Marquis of Tweeddale, its President, for testing the temperature of the sea, were again sent out by the Fishery Board to their officers and the temperature obtained at different periods of the herring fishery. Daily registers of the weather were kept and other particulars furnished to the Society, both by the district Fishery Officers and by Samuel M'Donald, Esq., commander of the "Vigilant," fishery cruiser. From the registers and the information thus supplied the following conclusions have in the meantime been drawn by the Committee of the Society:—

"From the observations of the catch of herrings and of the temperature of the sea, "off the east coast of Scotland, during the two seasons 1874 and 1875, it is seen—(1.) That "the temperature of the sea from the middle of August to the close of the fishing season was "continuously and considerably higher in 1875 than in 1874; and (2.) That the catch of "herrings was continuously and considerably lower during 1875 than during the same "period of 1874.

"Another result is this:—If there be a district where, from any cause, the temperature "of the sea is lower than in surrounding districts, in that district the catch of herrings is "heavier; and conversely, if there be a district where, from any cause, the temperature of "the sea is higher than in surrounding districts, in that district the catch of herrings is less. "Among the causes which bring about a local increase or decrease of sea temperature, the "chief are clouded or clear skies in respective districts, according as these occur during the "day or during the night. These local variations in the temperature of the sea in their "bearings on the catch of herrings have been shown by the observations both of 1874 and "1875.

"Another important point is the relations of surface temperature to bottom temperature, and the relations of the deepest parts of the sea to the positions of the fishing "grounds. It is found, for instance, that when the surface temperature is high—higher "than lower down—the fish, if any be caught, strike the nets far down in such a way as to "lead to the supposition that a good deal of failure may often arise from the nets not going "deep enough. The fish prefer apparently, so far as the inquiry has gone, the lower to the "higher temperature. The Herring Committee are most desirous of carrying out this line "of inquiry into greater detail, if some of the fishermen could be induced to take the "trouble of observing the temperature of the sea at the surface and also at the depth at "which the fish strike the nets.

"The influence of thunderstorms was equally seen as in former years. If there is a "thunderstorm of some magnitude extending over a large portion of the east of Scotland, "good takes may be made on that day, but on the following day few if any fish are caught "over that part of the coast, *unless at the extreme verge of a deep part of the sea*, as if "the fish were retreating thither.

"Owing to the shortness of the time over which the inquiry has extended, the Committee wish these results to be considered only as provisional. The results are, however, "of the greatest value, not merely as indicating the lines of inquiry to be followed in further "carrying on this large investigation, but also as indicating, in some cases not obscurely, "the nature of the results which will ultimately be established,—results which, since they "lead directly to a knowledge of the localisation of the herring, will serve as a guide to the "fishermen where to set their nets with the highest probability of success."

The *Shipping Gazette* states that Herr von Freedon of Hamburg, Director of the German See Warte, has been giving attention to the same points in relation to the herring fishery as those which have occupied the Meteorological Society of Scotland, and that by analysis of the log-books of the luggers engaged in the fishery, he has furnished the Fishery Company of Embden with elaborate reports upon the influences which affect the fishery, especially upon the influence of winds and the temperature of the sea. Herr von Freedon has come to the conclusion that north-west winds are the best for large catches, and northerly winds better than southerly, westerly better than easterly; also, that moderately strong winds, sufficient to ruffle the surface of the sea, are better than

calm weather, and light winds almost as unfavourable as stiff breezes; a ruffling of the sea being, in his opinion, of considerable importance to success of fishing. For the temperature of the sea he regards a temperature from 53 to 57 degrees of Fahrenheit as the most favourable, and that the chances of success diminish with higher or lower temperatures.

The winter herring fishery of 1875-76 was better than that of 1874-75, but not everywhere, as the catch at Anstruther proved the smallest on record at that station since the year 1856. In the upper part of the Firth of Forth it was better than in 1874, as it also was upon the coast of Caithness. At Wick some of the winter herrings produced the very high price of 84s. per cran, a price never before known to have been paid there. At Lybster, a little to the south of Wick, 75s. per cran was realised. The average price paid in both places for herrings during the winter fishing was from 58s. to 60s. per cran, a very high figure. At Anstruther, although from the scarcity of herrings some had been sold as high as 90s. per cran, the average price was not more than 52s. per cran; but there, this was unprecedentedly high as an average price. The fish of this winter were better and larger than those of previous winters, and were sold fresh or made into bloaters and despatched to London and other large cities. The winter herring fishery upon the outer coasts can never be on a large scale, as at that time of year herrings do not appear there in abundance as they sometimes do in the firths; but it is satisfactory to perceive that the rich markets of the south having been opened by lines of railway, fishermen and curers in the north have been alert to take advantage of this, and have been rewarded for their enterprise by realizing high prices for all the herrings caught.

The Cod and Ling Fishery of 1875 yielded larger returns than that of the previous year, the return for 1875 being 187,788½ cwts. cured dried against 143,466¼ cwts. in 1874; and 8,503½ barrels cured in pickle against 6,754 barrels in 1874. These figures give an increase for 1875 of 44,322¼ cwts. cured dried, and 1,749½ barrels cured in pickle, which led to an export in 1875 of nearly 21,000 more cwts. of cod cured dried than in 1874, the increase of export being alike to Ireland, to the Continent, and to places out of Europe. Of the increase in the number of cwts. cured dried, the larger portion is due this year to boats fishing upon the home coast, and not to vessels fitted out for the deep sea and Faroe fishing. The vessels that proceed to the deep sea and Faroe fishing are in general fitted out from Shetland; of these there were nine fewer fitted out in 1875 than in the year preceding, but nevertheless there was very little falling off in the catch, which reached within 180 cwts. of what was taken in 1874.

The number of applications to register fishing boats made to the Board's officers in 1875 by their owners or masters was 736, of registers issued 726, and of registers examined and indorsed 6474, an increase upon each head over the return of the previous year. The number of boats detained for non-compliance with the Order in Council regulations for fishing boats was 139, of boats boarded and warned to carry lights 45: these returns prove the good working of the Sea Fisheries Act 1868 and the advance of the fishermen in their observance of its requirements, the registers showing increase and the detentions very marked decrease upon those of previous years. In the performance of the additional duties imposed by this Act, and in watchful care over the cure and branding of herrings and all that relates to the interests of the trade, the fishery officers have been unfailingly assiduous, and the Board feel it due to Laurence Lamb, Esq., the General Inspector, to George Reiach, Esq., the assistant Inspector, and the rest of the staff of officers, thus to recognise their zeal and the valuable services they have rendered in their several departments and stations.

As respects barometers, the kind interest taken by Robert H. Scott, Esq., Director of the Meteorological Department, London, in the distribution of these useful instruments to fishing towns and creeks, was evinced this year in the issue of a barometer on loan to Stonehaven and to Dunbeath, and also one between the creeks of Inverallochy and Cairnbulg; places where they were much wanted and gladly welcomed by the fishermen. The Board's cruiser "Vigilant" and the local fishery officers proved of much use in getting them conveyed to their destinations and properly set up there, a point of great consequence for their permanent utility and preservation.

Two Gun Boats, the "Tyrian" and the "Netley" from H.M.S. "Favourite," Guardship in the Firth of Forth, and one, the "Pheasant" from H.M.S. "Endymion," Guardship in the Humber, were as usual put by the Admiralty in communication with the Board, on behalf of the herring fishery of the east coast of Scotland and north-east coast of England during the period that foreign fishing vessels, with their superintending cruisers, frequent that fishery; and for the same period H.M.S. "Jackal" was withdrawn by the Admiralty from the west coast and placed upon the east coast; these vessels, with the "Vigilant" cruiser belonging to the Board, were stationed so as to occupy the coast from the Fern Islands to Duncansby Head. While the "Jackal" was upon her station off Wick, the course taken

by Lieut. H. T. Clanchy, her commander, towards certain fishing boats in stress of weather from a heavy gale on the 29th and 30th of July, gave rise to so much public comment that it had to be brought under consideration of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, who disposed of it accordingly; all officers in command of H.M. ships being, in respect to their proceedings at sea, responsible alone to naval authorities. The presence of the Gun Boats was effective in preventing the intrusion of foreigners, and the "Vigilant" also co-operated in this duty. When stationed off Peterhead she was instrumental in obtaining from the "Mira," steam-ship, compensation for the master and crew of the fishing boat "Iona" of Fraserburgh, PD. 708, which the "Mira" had run down; and the manner in which Messrs. Rathbone Brothers, Liverpool, the owners of the "Mira," met the claim deserves all commendation. The "Vigilant" likewise in the course of the year rendered great assistance to the crews of the fishing boats she was engaged in superintending, especially in cases where the boats had been disabled by coming foul of each other or were in distress from gales of wind; and when cruising between Fraserburgh and Peterhead during the summer herring fishery, from the large number of boats congregated there and the broken weather, she had several opportunities for such service and the aid she gave was much appreciated by the fishermen.

The Pier and Quay Grant for 1875 having, as stated in last year's Report, been appropriated by Parliament towards the works of Anstruther Union Harbour has been so applied, but the removal of the debris lying at the mouth of the harbour, which was referred to in the Report as occupying much time and as unavoidably tedious from its dependence upon weather and tides, has proved much slower and more difficult than was anticipated. It has however been proceeded with in so far as it could be by divers, but the nature of the work has rendered necessary the opening of communications with the Treasury for bringing it to a more rapid conclusion, and for finishing what remains to be done to the harbour. The masonry has been exposed to very severe storms with high tides during the year, but has withstood them without injury.

The Report of the Engineers, and the Accounts of the year's Expenditure of the annual Pier or Quay Grant, and of the Special Parliamentary Grant for Anstruther Union Harbour, will be found in the Appendix, along with the Returns and Statistics of the Fisheries for the year, in the following order:—

HERRING FISHERY.

No. 1.—Account of Vessels fitted out in Scotland for the Herring Fishery, with the Herrings Salted or Cured on board;

No. 2.—Account of Herrings Cured or Salted on Shore in Scotland;

No. 3.—Account of the Total Quantity of Herrings Cured in Scotland;

No. 4.—Account of the Total Quantity of Herrings in Scotland Branded, with the amount of Fees collected thereon;

No. 5.—Account of the Export of Herrings from Scotland; with a Supplementary Note showing, for the Export to the Continent, the Ports to which the Herrings have been Shipped;

No. 6.—Account of the Number of Cran Measures in Scotland adjusted and Branded;

Abstract of the Total Quantity of White Herrings Cured, Branded, and Exported, from 1st June 1809 to 31st December 1875; showing also the Countries to which they have been Exported.

COD AND LING FISHERY.

No. 1.—Account of Vessels fitted out in Scotland for the Cod and Ling Fishery, with the quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake they Cured;

No. 2.—Account of Cod, Ling, and Hake, taken by Open Boats at the Cod and Ling Fishery in Scotland, and Cured;

No. 3.—Account of the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake taken both by Vessels and Open Boats at the Cod and Ling Fishery in Scotland, and Cured;

No. 4.—Account of the Export of Cod, Ling, and Hake from Scotland;

Abstract of the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured and Exported, from 10th October 1820 to 31st December 1875.

FISHERY STATISTICS.

No. 1.—Account of Boats, Men, &c., employed at the Herring Fishery in Scotland, in one selected week for each District;

No. 2.—Account of Boats, Fishermen, &c., with the estimated Value of Boats, Nets, and Lines employed in the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries of Scotland;

No. 3.—Account of the Tonnage of Shipping, and Number of Seamen employed in the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries of Scotland;

No. 4.—Abstract of Tonnage of Vessels and Boats; and of the Number of Seamen, Fishermen, and Persons employed in the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries of Scotland.

Report by the Engineers upon the Harbour Works in progress under the Fishery Board: Scotland.

General Account of the Expenditure on Harbours, Piers, or Quays.

Abstract showing the Expenditure on each Work.

SUMMARY.

Upon comparing the Accounts of 1875 with those of 1874, it will be seen,—That in the Herring Fishery the total quantity of Herrings cured in 1875 was 942,980 Barrels; the total quantity branded, 523,789½ Barrels; and the total quantity exported 660,970½ Barrels; being a decrease from the preceding year of 57,581 Barrels in the quantity cured, and 76,344¼ Barrels in the quantity exported; but an increase of 6,231 Barrels in the quantity branded.

That in the Cod and Ling Fishery 187,788½ cwts. were cured dried, and 8,503½ Barrels cured in pickle; and that the quantity exported was 81,880½ cwts. cured dried; being an increase over the preceding year of 44,322¼ cwts. in the quantity cured dried, and 1,749½ Barrels in the quantity cured in pickle, and of 20,967½ cwts. in the quantity exported.

That the number of Fishing-Boats in Scotland was 14,656, and of Fishermen and Boys 45,082; and that the estimated value of the Boats, Nets, and Lines employed in the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries was £1,092,275, being a decrease of 191 Boats, and of 144 Fishermen; but an increase of £19,498 in the estimated value of Boats, Nets, and Lines.

CAITHNESS.
JAMES T. GIBSON-CRAIG.
ELCHO.
JAMES MATHESON.
GEORGE LOCH.
LYON PLAYFAIR.
ANDREW COVENTRY.
ALEX$^{R.}$ S. FINLAY.
GEORGE J. ALLMAN.
GEORGE YOUNG.
FRANCIS ABBOTT.
JOHN DE COURCY AGNEW.
EDWARD S. GORDON.
WILLIAM WATSON.

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

ACCOUNT of the Number of VESSELS fitted out in SCOTLAND for the HERRING FISHERY, in the Year ended 31st December 1875; the Districts from which fitted out; the Tonnage and Number of Men; the Netting, Salt, and Barrels Shipped; and the Barrels of Herrings Cured.

DISTRICTS.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.	Netting.	Salt.	Barrels.	Herrings Cured				Total Cured in Vessels.
							Gutted.		Ungutted.		
							Gutted and Packed within 24 hours after being caught.	Gutted and Packed but *not* within 24 hours after being caught.	Barrels.	Barrels of Bulk.	
	Number.	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Square Yds.*	*Bushels.*	*Number.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Barrels.*
Stornoway, .	6	655	59	...	6,544	...	...	...	...	3253½	3,253½
Loch Broom, .	2	27	10	10,000	180	95	50	...	...	...	50
Loch Carron and Skye,	28	576	91	73,000	7,722	3,858	3,093½	...	6	...	3,099½
Fort William, .	10	200	39	74,000	1,760	890	764½	...	...	130	894½
Campbeltown, .	9	124	37	71,400	890	580	147	...	...	...	147
Inverary, . .	22	473¾	92	84,000	4,814	2,452	1,098	...	...	...	1,098
Rothesay, . .	15	225	47	102,000	1,591	1,161	610	63	...	...	673
Greenock, . .	6	149	24	14,000	1,878	1,016	3,242	...	...	...	3,242
Ballantrae, .	5	97	15	...	856	494	564	205	35	125	929
Total,	103	2,526¾	414	428,400	26,235	10,546	9,569	268	41	3,508½	13,386½

Note.—The above 103 Fishing Vessels made 127 Voyages.

Fishery Board: Scotland: Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. II.

ACCOUNT of the Number of Barrels of WHITE HERRINGS Cured or Salted in SCOTLAND by Fish-Curers on Shore, in the Year ended 31st December 1875; and the Districts in which Cured, distinguishing the Herrings Cured Gutted from those Cured Ungutted.

DISTRICTS.	Herrings Cured Gutted.		Herrings Cured Ungutted.		Total Cured on Shore.
	Gutted and packed within 24 hours after being caught.	Gutted and packed, but *not* within 24 hours after being caught.	Barrels.	Barrels of Bulk.	
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth, . . .	23,976	46	7,221	11,501	42,744
Leith, . . .	...	...	...	610	610
Anstruther, . . .	25	...	25	3,900	3,950
Montrose . . .	19,753	677	10,551	5,504	36,485
Aberdeen, . . .	60,116	240	4,699½	11,657½	76,713
Peterhead, . . .	191,684	8,433	4,323	865	205,305
Fraserburgh, . . .	280,975	756	1,049	1,504	284,284
Banff, . . .	42,837	92	583	20	43,532
Buckie, . . .	9,873	10	656	...	10,539
Findhorn, . . .	5,239	...	1,464	...	6,703
Cromarty, . . .	1,754	...	75	...	1,829
Helmsdale, . . .	7,306	50	577	...	7,933
Lybster, . . .	16,994	46	264	...	17,304
Wick, . . .	82,388½	3,547	680	...	86,615½
Orkney Isles, . .	14,180	400	...	...	14,580
Shetland Isles, . .	2,896	...	...	...	2,896
Stornoway, . . .	45,820	...	...	2,636	48,456
Loch Broom, . . .	724	...	...	50	774
Loch Carron and Skye, .	1,577	...	...	1,035	2,612
Fort William, . .	1,714	...	155	...	1,869
Campbeltown, . .	130	...	...	6,150	6,280
Inverary, . . .	570	...	...	12,687	13,257
Rothesay, . . .	82	...	...	3,675	3,757
Greenock, . . .	...	75	...	844	919
Ballantrae, . . .	...	...	...	9,647	9,647
Total, .	810,613½	14,372	32,322½	72,285½	929,593½

Fishery Board: Scotland: Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

HERRING FISHERY ACCOUNTS.

No. III.

ACCOUNT of the Total Number of Barrels of WHITE HERRINGS Cured or Salted in SCOTLAND in the Year ended 31st December 1875; distinguishing the Herrings Cured Gutted from those Cured Ungutted.

DISTRICTS.	Herrings Cured Gutted.		Herrings Cured Ungutted.		TOTAL HERRINGS CURED.
	Gutted and packed within 24 hours after being caught.	Gutted and packed; but *not* within 24 hours after being caught.	Barrels.	Barrels of Bulk.	
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth,	23,976	46	7,221	11,501	42,744
Leith,	...	...	...	610	610
Anstruther,	25	...	25	3,900	3,950
Montrose,	19,753	677	10,551	5,504	36,485
Aberdeen,	60,116	240	4,699½	11,657½	76,713
Peterhead,	191,684	8,433	4,323	865	205,305
Fraserburgh,	280,975	756	1,049	1,504	284,284
Banff,	42,837	92	583	20	43,532
Buckie,	9,873	10	656	...	10,539
Findhorn,	5,239	...	1,464	...	6,703
Cromarty,	1,754	...	75	...	1,829
Helmsdale,	7,306	50	577	...	7,933
Lybster,	16,994	46	264	...	17,304
Wick,	82,388½	3,547	680	...	86,615½
Orkney Isles,	14,180	400	...	...	14,580
Shetland Isles,	2,896	...	...	...	2,896
Stornoway,	45,820	...	...	5,889½	51,709½
Loch Broom,	774	...	...	50	824
Loch Carron and Skye,	4,670½	...	6	1035	5,711½
Fort William,	2,478½	...	155	130	2,763½
Campbeltown,	277	...	...	6,150	6,427
Inverary,	1,668	...	...	12,687	14,355
Rothesay,	692	63	...	3,675	4,430
Greenock,	3,242	75	...	844	4,161
Ballantrae,	564	205	35	9,772	10,576
Total,	820,182½	14,640	32,363½	75,794	942,980

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

Showing the NUMBER of BARRELS of HERRINGS Cured or Salted on the West Coast of Scotland, in the year ended 31st December 1875; stated by the Districts where the Herrings were caught.

DISTRICTS.	BARRELS.
Stornoway,	51,709½
Loch Broom,	824
Loch Carron and Skye,	9,992½
Fort William,	2,726½
Campbeltown,	6,660
Inverary,	14,097
Rothesay,	4,362
Greenock,	919
Ballantrae,	9,667
Total,	100,957½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

HERRING FISHERY ACCOUNTS.

No. IV.

ACCOUNT of the Total Number of Barrels of WHITE HERRINGS in SCOTLAND Branded in the Year ended 31st December 1875; and of the Brandings in each District, distinguishing Herrings Bung-packed from Herrings Re-packed; with Return of the Fees collected thereon under the Act 21 and 22 Victoriæ, cap. 69.

DISTRICTS.	Description of Barrels Branded.		
	Bung-Packed.	Re-packed.	TOTAL BRANDED.
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth,	5,597½	...	5,597½
Leith,	132	...	132
Montrose,	14,059½	102	14,161½
Aberdeen,	45,546½	...	45,546½
Peterhead,	138,099	...	138,099
Fraserburgh,	200,000	..	200,000
Banff,	30,016½	...	30,016½
Buckie,	7,079½	...	7,079½
Findhorn,	4,145	...	4,145
Cromarty,	435½	...	435½
Helmsdale,	5,767	...	5,767
Lybster,	13,911	...	13,911
Wick,	54,007½	...	54,007½
Orkney Isles,	4,189½	...	4,189½
Shetland Isles,	701½	...	701½
Total,	523,687½	102	523,789½*

* Of this number 281,449½ Barrels were Branded Crown "FULL."
„ 156,007 „ were Branded Crown "MATIES."
„ 54,835½ „ were Branded Crown "SPENT."
„ 31,395½ „ were Branded Crown "MIXED."
„ 102 „ were Branded Crown "RE-PACKED.

523,789½ Barrels.

The Fees thereon amounted to £8,729 16 6
Bank Interest, . . . 0 14 11

Total Receipts, £8,730 11 5

NOTE showing the Total Number of Barrels in the foregoing Account Branded "FULL," "MATIES," or "SPENT."

DISTRICTS.	Number of Barrels assorted and Branded *Crown Full.*	Number of Barrels assorted and Branded *Maties.*	Number of Barrels assorted and Branded *Spent.*
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth,	3,281½	719	654
Leith,	9	10	113
Montrose,	6,805½	5,537	1,622
Aberdeen,	26,374½	10,005½	2,206½
Peterhead,	74,251½	49,890½	12,860½
Fraserburgh,	95,771	57,449	28,255½
Banff,	11,854	15,073	2,095
Buckie,	3,733½	2,975	371
Findhorn,	2,306	1,137	646
Cromarty,	262	87½	26
Helmsdale,	4,362½	1,236	168½
Lybster,	8,820½	2,878½	2,103
Wick,	40,513	8,237	2,737½
Orkney Isles,	2,669½	772	711
Shetland Isles,	435½	...	266
Total,	281,449½	156,007	54,835½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

HERRING FISHERY ACCOUNTS.

No. V.

ACCOUNT of the Number of Barrels of WHITE HERRINGS in SCOTLAND Exported in the Year ended 31st December 1875; distinguishing the Export to Ireland, to the Continent, and to places out of Europe; distinguishing also Herrings Cured Gutted from Herrings Cured Ungutted; and Herrings Bung-Packed from Herrings Re-packed.

DISTRICTS.	BARRELS OF HERRINGS EXPORTED.							
	To Ireland.			To the Continent.		To Places out of Europe.		TOTAL EXPORTED.
	Bung-Packed.		Barrels of Bulk.	Bung-Packed.		Bung-packed.	Re-packed.	
	Gutted.	Ungutted.		Gutted.	Ungutted.	Gutted.	Gutted.	
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Number.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth,	3,106	...	...	4,391	...	...	...	7,497
Leith,	...	...	...	14,526	...	...	...	14,526
Montrose,	924	231	...	11,832½	...	...	...	12,987½
Aberdeen,	...	...	...	46,841	...	...	...	46,841
Peterhead,	1,323	...	...	154,875	...	...	...	156,198
Fraserburgh,	...	...	170	225,544½	606	...	...	226,320½
Banff,	643½	...	...	33,455½	...	...	...	34,099
Buckie,	...	...	...	8,225½	...	...	...	8,225½
Findhorn,	...	...	...	4,128½	...	...	...	4,128½
Cromarty,	1,286	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,286
Helmsdale,	...	...	...	4,105	...	...	...	4,105
Lybster,	...	...	...	13,660½	...	...	...	13,660½
Wick,	17,835½	98	...	57,550	...	...	...	75,483½
Orkney Isles,	5,106½	...	...	6,446½	...	...	...	11,553
Shetland Isles,	45	...	...	1,840½	...	...	...	1,885½
Greenock,	2,665½	...	...	...	...	...	1,350½	4,016
Sent from Scotland to England, and thence Exported,	...	...	...	3,157½	...	60	1,988½	5,206
Total,	32,935	329	170	623,531½	606	60	3,339	660,970½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE showing the Ports or Places to which the Herrings Exported to the Continent were Shipped.

DISTRICTS.	BARRELS OF HERRINGS EXPORTED.																	Total Exported to the Continent.
	RUSSIA.				GERMAN EMPIRE.									HOLLAND.	BELGIUM.	Other Places on the Continent.		
	Odessa.	Petersburg.	Riga.	Libau.	Memel.	Königsberg.	Elbing.	Danzig.	Stolpemunde.	Stettin.	Altona.	Hamburg.	Harburg.	Bremen	Rotterdam.	Ghent.		
	Barrels.	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Eyemouth,	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	660	3,731	...	...	...	...	4,391
Leith,	...	935½	...	...	...	367	...	...	...	4,255½	...	7,146½	...	228	1,588½	...	117	14,638
Montrose,	...	...	...	875	...	1,842½	...	5,518	...	2,855½	...	24½	717	...	...	...	...	11,832½
Aberdeen,	1,250	...	...	4,899	...	3,440½	...	3,148½	...	24,229	...	3,675	7,794½	...	...	...	...	48,436½
Peterhead,	1,450	1,830	...	...	1,469½	20,338	...	35,753	...	62,505	1,791½	16,618½	14,165½	...	...	404	...	156,325
Fraserburgh,	...	880	1,006	15,308	...	50,466½	680	20,045	1,285	80,478½	...	28,890	23,998½	2,389	724	...	...	226,150½
Banff,	...	1,482	...	1,097½	...	9,361½	...	2,112½	...	15,080	...	2,260	2,062	...	...	...	...	33,455½
Buckie,	...	...	...	1,000½	...	1,627½	...	755	...	2,324	...	...	2,518½	...	...	...	...	8,225½
Findhorn,	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	940	...	3,188½	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	4,128½
Helmsdale,	...	...	...	...	...	662½	...	284	...	1,292½	...	656	1,210	...	...	...	...	4,105
Lybster,	...	...	...	...	...	433	...	4,573½	...	4,784½	...	3,186½	683	...	...	...	...	13,660½
Wick,	...	...	...	1,021	...	5,873	...	12,297½	...	27,805	...	7,292½	1,820	943	...	498	...	57,550
Orkney Isles,	...	...	336	...	...	...	...	1,894½	...	2,368½	...	1,412½	435	...	...	...	...	6,446½
Shetland Isles,	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,840½	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,840½
Stornoway,	...	20,139¾	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8,219	...	4,593¾	...	...	...	...	...	32,952
Total,	2,700	25,266¾	1,342	24,201	1,469½	94,412	680	87,321½	1,285	241,226	1,791½	76,415¾	59,135	3,560	2,312½	902	117	624,137½

Fishery Board : Scotland :
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. VI.

ACCOUNT of the Number of Crans and Half Crans, adjusted as Measures for the Purchase and Sale of Fresh Herrings and Branded in Scotland, in the Year ended 31st December 1875.

DISTRICTS.	Adjusted and Branded.	
	Crans.	Half Crans.
Leith,	2	...
Montrose,	30	...
Peterhead,	2	...
Greenock,	4	...
Total,	38	...

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

ABSTRACT showing the Total Quantity of WHITE HERRINGS Cured, Branded, and Exported, year by year, *in so far as brought under cognizance of Fishery Officers*, from the 1st of June 1809 to the 31st of December 1875; distinguishing the Export to Ireland, to the Continent, and to places out of Europe.

PERIODS.	Total Quantity of Herrings Cured.			Total Quantity of Herrings Branded.	Total Quantity of Herrings Exported.			Grand Total Exported.
	Gutted.	Ungutted including Bulk.	Total Cured.		To Ireland.	To the Continent.	To places out of Europe.	
	Barrels.	*Bls. or Crans.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Bls. or Crans.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Period extending from 1st June 1809 to 5th April 1810,	42,548	47,637½	90,185½	34,701	28,014	...	7,834	35,848
Year ended 5th April 1811,	65,430	26,397½	91,827½	55,662½	28,212	...	9,921	38,133
Year ended 5th April 1812,	72,515½	39,004	111,519½	58,430	30,417½	4,730	27,672½	62,820
Year ended 5th April 1813,	89,900¾	63,587½	153,488¼	70,027½	57,980	11,046½	40,699	109,725½
Year ended 5th April 1814,	52,931½	57,611	110,542½	38,184½	43,061½	23,943	51,399	118,403½
Year ended 5th April 1815,	105,372¼	54,767	160,139¼	83,376	49,635¾	35,891	55,778½	141,305¼
Year ended 5th April 1816,	135,981	26,670¾	162,651¾	116,436	29,456½	15,563	62,668½	107,688
Year ended 5th April 1817,	155,776	36,567½	192,343½	140,018½	36,341	44,432½	57,855	138,628½
Year ended 5th April 1818,	204,270¼	23,420¾	227,691	183,089½	53,386½	43,896	65,057	162,339½
Year ended 5th April 1819,	303,777½	37,116½	340,894	270,022½	89,704	52,333	85,125	227,162
Year ended 5th April 1820,	347,190½	35,301	382,491½	309,700½	101,109½	64,302½	88,104	253,516
Year ended 5th April 1821,	413,308	28,887¾	442,195¾	363,872	125,445	89,524	79,836½	294,805½
Year ended 5th April 1822,	291,626½	24,897¾	316,524¼	263,205½	102,719	34,752	77,485	214,956
Year ended 5th April 1823,	225,037	23,832	248,869	203,110	56,528	38,002½	75,914½	170,445
Year ended 5th April 1824,	335,450	56,740¾	392,190¾	299,631	116,747½	40,231	82,652	239,630½
Year ended 5th April 1825,	303,397	44,268¼	347,665¼	270,844½	96,409½	35,029½	70,577½	202,016½
Year ended 5th April 1826,	340,118	39,115¾	379,233¾	294,422½	121,386½	28,167¾	67,519	217,073¼
Year ended 5th April 1827,	259,171¼	29,324	288,495¼	223,606	78,735	16,701	70,970	166,406
Year ended 5th April 1828,	339,360	60,418	399,778	279,317½	109,108½	24,489½	78,061	211,659
Year ended 5th April 1829,	300,242½	55,737	355,979½	234,827	107,651	28,280½	69,944	205,875½
Year ended 5th April 1830,	280,933½	48,623½	329,557	218,418½	89,680½	24,302	67,672	181,654½
Year ended 5th April 1831,	371,096	68,274¼	439,370¼	237,085	130,300½	61,655½	72,947	264,903
Year ended 5th April 1832,	313,113¾	49,547	362,660¾	157,839½	128,458	31,100¼	57,941½	217,499¾
Year ended 5th April 1833,	353,684½	63,279¾	416,964¼	168,259½	114,137	47,556½	58,991	220,684½
Year ended 5th April 1834,	382,677½	68,853¾	451,531¼	178,000½	149,254	55,852	66,987½	272,093½
Year ended 5th April 1835,	217,242½	60,074½	277,317	85,079½	73,960	34,050	50,795½	158,805½
Year ended 5th April 1836,	399,334	98,280¾	497,614¾	192,317	168,960	48,451½	55,982	273,393½
Year ended 5th April 1837,	290,169	107,660¼	397,829¼	114,192	102,968½	46,777	39,520	189,265½
Year ended 5th April 1838,	382,400	125,374¾	507,774¾	141,552	139,095	57,388½	38,674½	235,158
Year ended 5th April 1839,	382,229	173,330¾	555,559¾	153,659½	149,926	64,870	24,934½	239,730½
Year ended 5th April 1840,	405,379½	138,565½	543,945	152,231	157,359	82,515½	12,647½	252,522
Year ended 5th April 1841,	431,157	126,105¼	557,262¼	154,189	150,517½	90,951½	8,668	250,137
Year ended 5th April 1842,	489,620½	177,624¾	667,245¼	190,922½	187,953	91,069½	5,713½	284,736
Year ended 5th April 1843,	442,290	181,129¾	623,419¾	162,713	165,327½	120,136½	6,336½	291,800½
Year ended 5th April 1844,	473,556¾	191,803	665,359¾	182,988	127,770	181,953	3,793½	313,516½
Period extending from 5th April 1844 to 5th Jan. 1845,	393,312	132,720¾	526,032¾	140,632	120,293	143,754	2,326½	266,373½
Year ended 5th January 1846,	411,271	121,375	532,646	142,473½	127,027½	113,678	2,488½	243,194

ABSTRACT showing the Total Quantity of WHITE HERRINGS Cured, Branded, and Exported, year by year, etc.—*continued.*

PERIODS.	Total Quantity of Herrings Cured.			Total Quantity of Herrings Branded.	Total Quantity of Herrings Exported.			Grand Total Exported.
	Gutted.	Ungutted including Bulk.	Total Cured.		To Ireland.	To the Continent.	To places out of Europe.	
	Barrels.	*Bls. or Crans.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Bls. or Crans.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*	*Barrels.*
Year ended 5th January 1847,	414,915¼	192,535¾	607,451	156,278½	102,585	148,363½	4,765½	255,714
Year ended 5th January 1848,	372,989½	189,754	562,743½	146,500½	102,690	142,532	4,959	250,181
Year ended 5th January 1849,	392,827	251,541¼	644,368¼	153,944	78,262½	168,049	3,682½	249,994
Year ended 5th January 1850,	507,024½	263,673¾	770,698¼	213,286½	78,889¾	257,108	4,258½	340,256¼
*Year ended 5th January 1851, for Scotland and the Isle of Man only, .	378,187	165,822½	544,009½	172,924½	66,138	198,403	2,367	266,908
Year ended 5th January 1852, for do. do.	417,233¼	176,797¾	594,031	201,636½	81,340½	182,659	205	264,204½
Year ended 31st December 1852, for do. do.	375,693	123,094½	498,787½	169,159½	60,414	221,979	1,133	283,526
Year ended 31st December 1853, for do. do.	560,367	217,672¾	778,039¾	248,136½	95,339	242,853¼	4,438½	342,630¾
Year ended 31st December 1854, for do. do.	458,579½	177,982¾	636,562¼	211,844	121,883¾	237,893½	1,919½	361,696¾
Year ended 31st December 1855, for do. do.	582,715¼	183,988¼	766,703½	280,581½	97,377	344,029	858	442,264
Year ended 31st December 1856, for do. do.	466,429½	143,559	609,988½	223,281	89,670¾	256,741	1,199½	347,611¼
Year ended 31st December 1857, for do. do.	465,292½	115,521¼	580,813¾	218,992	58,534	307,275½	1,351	367,160½
Year ended 31st December 1858, for do. do.	470,393¼	165,730¼	636,124	233,374	79,054	269,819	1,331½	350,204½
†Year ended 31st December 1859, for do. do.	381,059¼	110,428	491,487¼	158,676	68,882	203,349½	748	272,979½
Year ended 31st December 1860, for do. do.	496,414½	184,778¾	681,193¼	231,913½	86,413	291,401½	156	377,970½
Year ended 31st December 1861, for do. do.	519,173	149,655½	668,828½	265,347	81,595½	308,334¼	384	390,313¾
Year ended 31st December 1862, for do. do.	656,048	174,856	830,904	346,712	70,879¾	423,182¾	847½	494,910
Year ended 31st December 1863, for do. do.	507,223	147,593½	654,816½	276,880½	72,074½	333,074¼	2,612¾	407,761½
Year ended 31st December 1864, for do. do.	478,781½	164,868¾	643,650¼	217,392	55,420½	307,282	1,805	364,507½
Year ended 31st December 1865, for do. do.	470,559½	151,203½	621,763	216,785	42,063	309,626	1,012	352,701
Year ended 31st December 1866, for do. do.	497,814½	160,332¼	658,146¾	249,510	47,319	328,272½	4,474½	380,066
Year ended 31st December 1867, for do. do.	631,759½	193,829½	825,589	317,421	42,364¼	432,994½	3,345½	478,704¼
Year ended 31st December 1868, for do. do.	445,468½	205,965¼	651,433¾	209,462½	43,414½	323,479¾	1,850½	368,744¾
*Year ended 31st Dec. 1869, for Scotland only, . .	488,831	186,312	675,143	244,522½	32,342½	346,793¾	2,197½	381,333¾
Year ended 31st December 1870, for do. .	657,059½	176,101	833,160½	299,381½	41,524	486,064	2,970	530,558
Year ended 31st December 1871, for do. .	668,489½	156,986¼	825,475¾	346,633½	46,347	502,534¼	2,724	551,605¼
Year ended 31st December 1872, for do. .	671,703½	102,156	773,859½	422,731½	24,147	523,540½	1,943½	549,631
Year ended 31st December 1873, for do. .	796,902	142,331½	939,233½	435,274½	32,465½	633,681	1,861½	668,008
Year ended 31st December 1874, for do. .	887,002½	113,558½	1,000,561	517,558½	28,137¼	706,967¾	2,209¾	737,314¾
Year ended 31st December 1875, for do. .	834,822½	108,157½	942,980	523,789½	33,434	624,137½	3,399	660,970½

N.B.—In the Six Years ending 5th April 1815, the Bounty on Herrings Cured Gutted, was 2s. per Barrel, while there was a Bounty at the same time of 2s. 8d. per Barrel, payable by the Excise on the Exportation of Herrings, whether Cured Gutted or Ungutted, but which ceased on the 1st June 1815; in the Eleven Years ending 5th April 1826, the Bounty on Herrings Cured Gutted was 4s. per Barrel; in the Four succeeding Years, the Bounty was reduced 1s. per Barrel each Year till the 5th of April 1830, when it ceased altogether, and has not since been renewed.

* The Collection of Returns for England ceased from the 5th of January 1850; and for the Isle of Man from the 1st of January 1869.

† By Act 21st and 22d Vict. cap. 69 (1858), there was imposed upon the Branding of Barrels and Half-Barrels of Herrings, a Fee of *Fourpence* per Barrel and *Twopence* per Half-Barrel.

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

COD AND LING FISHERY ACCOUNTS.

No. I.

ACCOUNT, by Districts, of the Number of Vessels fitted out in SCOTLAND for the COD and LING Fishery, in the Year ended 31st December 1875; of the Tonnage of the Vessels, and the Number of Men; also of the quantity of COD, LING, and HAKE Cured therefrom, distinguishing whether Cured Dried or Cured in Pickle.

DISTRICTS.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.	Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured in Vessels.		
				Number of Fish.	Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.
	Number.	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*
Fraserburgh, . . .	22	330	139	124,520	4,473	...
Orkney Isles, . . .	38	2,281	409	541,130	16,817	...
Shetland Isles, . . .	77	3,404	905	1,357,859	42,443	...
Total,	137	6,015	1,453	2,023,509	63,733	...

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. II.

ACCOUNT, by Districts, of the COD, LING, and HAKE taken at the Cod and Ling Fishery in SCOTLAND by Open Boats and Cured on Shore, in the Year ended 31st December 1875; distinguishing the Fish Cured Dried and the Fish Cured in Pickle.

DISTRICTS.	Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured on Shore.		
	Number of Fish.	Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.
	Number.	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*
Anstruther, ...	97,296	3,001	87
Montrose, ...	76,400	2,482	34
Aberdeen, ...	4,070	115	4
Peterhead, ...	30,493	427	532½
Fraserburgh, ...	102,854	3,484	15
Banff, ...	88,774	2,947	401
Buckie, ...	142,815	2,773	3,450
Findhorn, ...	81,493	1,754	1,414
Cromarty, ...	6,600	20	206
Helmsdale, ...	11,015	...	401
Lybster, ...	10,793	95	319
Wick, ...	64,813	981	1,518
Orkney Isles, ...	289,650	9,155	52
Shetland Isles, ...	2,100,940	69,369	...
Stornoway, ...	471,611	20,116	...
Loch Broom, ...	41,133	1,569	...
Loch Carron and Skye, . . .	22,676	868	10
Fort William, ...	83,216	2,974½	...
Campbeltown, ...	38,086	1,885	...
Inverary, ...	1,290	40	...
Ballantrae, ...	1,860	...	60
Total,	3,767,878	124,055½	8,503½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

COD AND LING FISHERY ACCOUNTS.

No. III.

ACCOUNT, by Districts, of the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake taken, both by Vessels and by open Boats, at the Cod and Ling Fishery in Scotland, and Cured, in the Year ended 31st December 1875; distinguishing the Fish Cured Dried and the Fish Cured in Pickle.

DISTRICTS.	Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured.		
	Number of Fish.	Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.
	Number.	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*
Anstruther,	97,296	3,001	87
Montrose,	76,400	2,482	34
Aberdeen,	4,070	115	4
Peterhead,	30,493	427	532½
Fraserburgh,	227,374	7,957	15
Banff,	88,774	2,947	401
Buckie,	142,815	2,773	3,450
Findhorn,	81,493	1,754	1,414
Cromarty,	6,600	20	206
Helmsdale,	11,015	...	401
Lybster,	10,793	95	319
Wick,	64,813	981	1,518
Orkney Isles,	830,780	25,972	52
Shetland Isles,	3,458,799	111,812	...
Stornoway,	471,611	20,116	...
Loch Broom,	41,133	1,569	...
Loch Carron and Skye,	22,676	868	10
Fort William,	83,216	2,974½	...
Campbeltown,	38,086	1,885	...
Inverary,	1,290	40	...
Ballantrae,	1,860	...	60
Total,	5,791,387	187,788½	8,503½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. IV.

ACCOUNT of the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake, Exported from Scotland, in the Year ended 31st December 1875, with the Districts from which Exported; distinguishing the Export to Ireland, to the Continent, and to places out of Europe; also whether Cured Dried or Cured in Pickle.

DISTRICTS.	COD, LING, AND HAKE EXPORTED			
	To Ireland.	To the Continent.	To places out of Europe.	Total Exported.
	Cured Dried.	Cured Dried.	Cured Dried.	Cured Dried.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Leith,	8,507	3,506	6,606	18,619
Aberdeen,	...	...	2,805	2,805
Orkney Isles,	2,165	...	...	2,165
Shetland Isles,	23,696	22,046	...	45,742
Stornoway,	185	...	...	185
Campbeltown,	1,566	...	...	1,566
Greenock,	7,371½	120	3,307	10,798½
Total,	43,490½	25,672	12,718	81,880½

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

ABSTRACT, showing the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake, Cured, Punched or Branded, and Exported, year by year, *in so far as brought under cognizance of Fishery Officers*, from the 10th of October 1820, when the System for Encouragement and Improvement of the Cod and Ling Fishery commenced, to the 31st of December 1875.

PERIODS.	Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured.			Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Punched or Branded.		Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Exported.			
	Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.		Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.	Cured Dried.			Cured in Pickle.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*	*Cwts.*	*qrs.*	*lbs.*	*Barrels.*
Period extending from 10th October 1820 to 5th April 1822,	...	...	...	50,235¼	4,919½	19,578	3	,,	...
Year ended 5th April 1823,	...	...	...	54,573	3,691	19,398	3	,,	...
Year ended 5th April 1824,	...	...	...	63,590	5,437	23,098	,,	3	...
Year ended 5th April 1825,	...	...	...	52,135	3,531	14,087	2	19	...
Year ended 5th April 1826,	69,136½	3,634¾	5,621	66,315¾	5,337	7,281	1	14	...
Year ended 5th April 1827,	95,161½	9,273	9,025	82,185¾	8,008½	14,051	2	27	...
Year ended 5th April 1828,	82,515¼	6,726	6,142½	74,103¾	5,609½	13,208	2	,,	...
Year ended 5th April 1829,	81,321¼	5,786	6,819	73,500½	6,204	20,587	3	4	...
Year ended 5th April 1830,	101,914	5,652½	8,836½	92,314½	8,464	16,369	3	15	...
Year ended 5th April 1831,	37,674	...	2,950½	34,337½	2,459½	11,920	1	1	...
Year ended 5th April 1832,	50,293	...	3,779½	13,879¾	3,230	20,168	3	16	47
Year ended 5th April 1833,	58,461½	...	6,467½	13,581¼	4,393½	14,754	1	26	67
Year ended 5th April 1834,	52,710½	...	5,522½	14,255½	3,829	16,298	3	,,	24
Year ended 5th April 1835,	44,152¾	...	3,767½	9,492¼	2,235	10,632	2	24	...
Year ended 5th April 1836,	38,040	...	6,276	6,766	3,018	10,992	2	20	...
Year ended 5th April 1837,	66,892½	...	7,273	9,589½	3,206	10,195	2	11	1½
Year ended 5th April 1838,	84,996¾	...	10,303	9,259½	4,373	22,166	2	12	36
Year ended 5th April 1839,	85,279¾	...	10,051½	23,936¼	5,093	26,701	3	,,	150
Year ended 5th April 1840,	93,560¾	...	6,053	21,695½	3,205	29,656	1	,,	24
Year ended 5th April 1841,	91,494¾	...	9,480	21,029¼	3,891	30,550	1	,,	44
Year ended 5th April 1842,	76,849	...	7,038½	13,283¾	2,164	25,293	1	,,	...
Year ended 5th April 1843,	77,207¼	...	6,431	10,030¼	1,342	23,737	3	,,	70
Year ended 5th April 1844,	92,813½	...	5,123	20,810¼	2,226½	35,476	,,	,,	4
Period extending from 5th April 1844 to 5th January 1845,	83,919	...	1,726	17,940¼	229	28,815	,,	,,	20
Year ended 5th January 1846,	92,323	...	5,037	14,372½	935	29,352	,,	,,	...
Year ended 5th January 1847,	90,783¾	...	6,341½	12,387½	1,492	34,435	1	,,	15
Year ended 5th January 1848,	86,624¼	...	6,247½	8,145¼	955	25,662	3	,,	...
Year ended 5th January 1849,	85,463	...	6,810½	9,520	1,681	22,608	3	,,	...
Year ended 5th January 1850,	98,903	...	6,588	15,556	997	24,154	1	,,	20
*Year ended 5th January 1851, for Scotland and the Isle of Man only, ...	90,658¾	...	5,032	† ...	...	22,304	1	,,	...

* The Collection of Returns for England ceased from the 5th of January 1850.
† The Punching and Branding of Cod and Ling ceased from the 5th of January 1850.

ABSTRACT, showing the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake, Cured, Punched or Branded, and Exported year by year, etc.—*continued.*

PERIODS.	Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Cured.			Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Punched or Branded.		Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake Exported.			
	Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.		Cured Dried.	Cured in Pickle.	Cured Dried.			Cured in Pickle.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*	*Cwts.*	*Barrels.*	*Cwts.*	*qrs.*	*lbs.*	*Barrels.*
Year ended 5th January 1852, for Scotland and the Isle of Man only,	92,083¼	...	7,019¾	...	...	17,141	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1852, for do. do.	102,976¼	...	6,886	...	...	18,994	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1853, for do. do.	105,596	...	5,122½	...	...	22,650	3	„	14
Year ended 31st Decr. 1854, for do. do.	109,684¼	...	6,166½	...	...	19,557	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1855, for do. do.	113,561¼	...	6,316½	...	...	29,154	2	„	25
Year ended 31st Decr. 1856, for do. do.	110,504¾	...	6,642	...	...	29,629	3	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1857, for do. do.	104,668½	...	4,393½	...	...	34,310	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1858, for do. do.	95,596	...	4,584	...	...	32,152	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1859, for do. do.	118,383	...	5,362½	...	...	35,923	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1860, for do. do.	115,688	...	4,339½	...	...	32,221	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1861, for do. do.	82,344¾	...	4,145½	...	...	26,961	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1862, for do. do.	100,657½	...	7,735½	...	...	32,969	3	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1863, for do. do.	129,725¾	...	7,337	...	...	53,736	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1864, for do. do.	107,758¼	...	7,963½	...	...	46,461	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1865, for do. do.	112,807	...	7,678	...	...	44,928	3	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1866, for do. do.	115,819	...	9,957½	...	...	47,753	„	„	15
Year ended 31st Decr. 1867, for do. do.	119,638¼	...	10,819	...	...	46,225	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1868, for do. do.	113,831	...	9,659	...	...	52,403	„	„	...
*Year ended 31st Decr. 1869, for Scotland only,	135,585¼	...	10,319	...	...	51,864	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1870, for do.	145,288¾	...	9,945	...	...	56,400	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1871, for do.	119,030	...	9,283	...	...	54,171	1	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1872, for do.	145,976½	...	11,940½	...	...	53,631	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1873, for do.	160,716½	...	12,381½	...	...	70,101	2	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1874, for do.	143,466¼	...	6,754	...	...	60,913	„	„	...
Year ended 31st Decr. 1875, for do.	187,788½	...	8,503½	...	...	81,880	2	„	...

N.B.—The Books of this department do not exhibit the Total Quantity of Cod, Ling, and Hake *Cured* till the Year commencing 5th April 1825. The Bounty, from the commencement of this Abstract to the 5th of April 1830, was 4s. per cwt. for Fish cured Dried, and 2s. 6d. per Barrel for Fish cured in Pickle, taken by the Crews of Vessels or Boats *not* on the Tonnage Bounty; while the Bounty for Vessels licensed for the Cod and Ling Fishery, on the *Tonnage* Bounty, was 50s. per Ton, for Tonnage and Cargo to the 5th of July 1826; 45s. from thence to the 5th of July 1827; 40s. to the 5th of July 1828; and 35s. to the 5th of April 1830, when the Bounties ceased altogether, and have not since been renewed.

* The collection of Returns for the Isle of Man ceased from the 1st of January 1869.

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

FISHERY STATISTICS.

No. I.

FISHERY STATISTICS.—Account of the Number of Boats, whether Decked or Undecked, *irrespective* of the places to which they belong, employed in the Herring Fishery: SCOTLAND: in the Season of 1875, in a selected Week for each District; with the Number of Fishermen and Boys by whom manned; of Coopers, Gutters, Packers, and Labourers employed at the said Fishery in the Week so selected, and the Total Number of all such Fishermen and other Persons so employed.

Districts where the Boats were employed at the Herring Fishery.	Boats.	Fishermen and Boys.	Coopers.	Gutters and Packers.	Labourers.	Total Persons employed.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
Eyemouth,	293	1,605	153	923	191	2,872
Leith,	70	280	60	140	35	515
Anstruther,	240	1,410	78	315	119	1,922
Montrose,	194	1,035	106	572	79	1,792
Aberdeen,	304	1,783	132	1,192	101	3,208
Peterhead,	730	4,380	339	2,240	267	7,226
Fraserburgh,	905	5,429	437	2,832	303	9,001
Banff,	212	1,060	87	773	120	2,040
Buckie,	57	308	20	172	23	523
Findhorn,	57	314	24	234	21	593
Cromarty,	40	205	18	124	16	363
Helmsdale,	95	526	37	308	13	884
Lybster,	169	937	60	452	57	1,506
Wick,	730	4,380	297	1,931	164	6,772
Orkney Isles,	317	1,836	82	671	16	2,605
Shetland Isles,	94	367	19	146	1	533
Stornoway,	1,253	6,285	267	3,135	140	9,827
Loch Broom,	230	790	2	120	13	925
Loch Carron and Skye,	200	600	15	212	5	832
Fort William,	320	720	13	225	10	968
Campbeltown,	178	445	1	10	...	456
Inverary,	244	976	3	224	28	1,231
Rothesay,	133	399	8	30	20	457
Greenock,	33	99	...	...	6	105
Ballantrae,	67	234	6	15	44	299

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. II.

FISHERY STATISTICS.—ACCOUNT of the Number and Tonnage of Boats, Decked or Undecked, employed in the Shore Curing Herring, and Cod and Ling Fisheries: SCOTLAND: in the Year ended 31st December 1875, with the Districts to which they belong; the Number of Fishermen and Boys by whom manned; the Number of Fish-curers, Coopers, and other Persons employed; with the estimated value of Boats, Nets, and Lines.

DISTRICTS.	FISHING BOATS.								Fishermen and Boys.	Fish Curers.	Coopers.	Other Persons (*Estimated*).	Total Persons Employed.	VALUE (*Estimated*) OF—			
	First Class. 30 feet Keel and upwards.		Second Class. From 18 to 30 feet Keel.		Third Class. Under 18 feet Keel.		Total.							Boats.	Nets.	Lines.	Total.
	Number.	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Tons.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*				
Eyemouth,	340	5,897	180	1,001	109	279	629	7,177	1,689	48	153	2,710	4,600	£31,886	£34,578	£5,410	£71,874
Leith,	166	3,156	379	1,804	11	20	556	4,980	1,401	20	102	1,047	2,570	22,744	29,359	3,605	55,708
Anstruther,	476	6,679	160	597	124	248	760	7,524	3,013	43	78	2,167	5,301	27,806	56,395	14,922	99,123
Montrose,	181	2,775	240	915	264	509	685	4,199	1,159	32	106	1,662	2,959	17,379	12,416	5,927	35,722
Aberdeen,	137	2,022	140	724	68	136	345	2,882	831	41	132	3,066	4,070	12,322	10,730	3,507	26,559
Peterhead,	272	4,352	180	1,080	133	399	585	5,831	1,350	62	342	3,054	4,808	25,125	33,198	4,900	63,223
Fraserburgh,	320	4,800	94	564	245	735	659	6,089	1,922	76	437	3,936	6,371	33,016	48,320	4,751	86,087
Banff,	272	3,264	113	678	61	183	446	4,125	1,267	53	87	1,270	2,677	12,724	21,760	4,860	39,344
Buckie,	648	9,720	85	425	169	507	902	10,652	3,383	28	73	2,736	6,220	59,672	64,800	20,899	145,371
Findhorn,	313	3,969	98	455	43	107	454	4,531	1,744	12	63	2,629	4,449	13,640	28,480	4,025	46,145
Cromarty,	135	1,792	128	618	30	62	293	2,472	925	7	26	593	1,551	6,847	12,022	2,027	20,896
Helmsdale,	106	1,370	57	262	40	84	203	1,716	729	14	39	438	1,220	3,893	10,600	1,455	15,948
Lybster,	217	3,003	20	112	20	20	257	3,135	1,143	21	60	509	1,733	11,185	12,997	692	24,874
Wick,	503	7,842	66	426	314	628	883	8,896	3,138	78	305	3,861	7,382	37,245	46,067	3,662	86,974
Orkney Isles,	306	3,951	37	287	401	908	744	5,146	2,756	32	82	1,055	3,925	15,315	14,060	1,345	30,720
Shetland Isles,	8	80	336	672	227	227	571	979	2,751	39	20	821	3,631	5,416	1,530	4,527	11,473
Stornoway,	227	3,405	408	2,867	419	1,257	1,054	7,529	4,010	37	67	4,272	8,386	18,658	23,008	11,467	53,133
Loch Broom,	85	1,175	88	704	458	1,374	631	3,253	2,785	15	3	445	3,248	8,445	17,430	2,436	28,311
Loch Carron and Skye,	21	315	170	900	510	1,020	701	2,235	2,098	34	14	1,076	3,222	6,996	17,302	2,265	26,563
Fort William,	29	305	153	635	440	930	622	1,870	1,386	57	13	607	2,063	4,774	5,074	1,168	11,016
Campbeltown,	63	991	231	945	205	345	499	2,281	1,226	37	5	408	1,676	13,325	10,892	932	25,149
Inverary,	25	405	507	2,495	291	582	823	3,482	1,889	45	3	469	2,406	15,995	24,439	1,600	42,034
Rothesay,	21	315	309	1,440	205	410	535	2,165	1,000	25	8	551	1,584	11,531	12,315	449	24,295
Greenock,	14	225	187	885	138	197	339	1,307	656	38	35	980	1,709	5,656	6,463	567	12,686
Ballantrae,	12	161	166	527½	302	351½	480	1,040	831	8	9	612	1,460	4,484	3,596	967	9,047
Total,	4,897	71,969	4,532	22,018½	5,227	11,518½	14,656	105,506	45,082	903	2,262	40,974	89,221	£426,079	£557,831	£108,365	£1,092,275

Fishery Board : Scotland :
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. III.

FISHERY STATISTICS.—ACCOUNT of the Tonnage of Shipping and of the number of Seamen engaged in the Trade of the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries: SCOTLAND: in the Year ended 31st December 1875; distinguishing those employed in Importing Stave Wood, Hoops, and Salt, in carrying Herrings or Cod Fish Coastwise, or Exporting them abroad, and distinguishing British from Foreign Tonnage and Men.

DISTRICTS.	TONNAGE AND MEN.																TOTAL.			
	Importing Stave Wood and Hoops for the Fisheries.				Importing Salt for the Fisheries.				Carrying Herrings or Cod-Fish Coastwise.				Exporting Herrings or Cod-Fish.							
	British.		Foreign.		British.		Foreign.		British.		Foreign.		British.		Foreign.		British.		Foreign.	
	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.
Eyemouth,	275	16	...	...	1,768	100	...	...	928	69	...	...	749	51	...	...	3,720	236	...	...
Leith,	350	20	300	25	730	54	50	4	780	52	...	...	2,075	207	...	...	3,935	333	350	29
Anstruther,	228	13	410	27	158	9	...	...	500	32	...	...	...	...	...	...	886	54	410	27
Montrose,	179	11	178	11	1,393	71	...	...	277	24	...	...	1,082	58	273	14	2,931	164	451	25
Aberdeen,	1,860	105	135	10	2,408	145	...	...	580	35	...	...	1,562	91	3,447	180	6,410	376	3,582	190
Peterhead,	1,321	71	1,807	124	6,904	486	340	16	740	40	...	...	11,143	598	4,821	232	20,108	1,195	6,968	372
Fraserburgh,	2,308	126	2,528	184	7,888	458	...	...	752	61	...	...	14,917	1,269	7,781	446	25,865	1,914	10,309	630
Banff,	...	...	590	46	3,031	141	...	...	50	14	...	...	2,833	173	336	21	5,914	328	926	67
Buckie,	...	...	39	4	458	31	...	...	18	2	...	...	788	50	...	...	1,264	83	39	4
Findhorn,	...	...	50	4	454	28	...	...	...	...	...	...	248	16	77	4	702	44	127	8
Cromarty,	70	12	...	...	227	18	...	...	40	4	...	...	194	14	...	...	531	48	...	...
Helmsdale,	184	18	...	...	358	23	...	...	145	12	...	...	265	16	110	5	952	69	110	5
Lybster,	...	...	140	9	426	27	...	...	50	12	...	...	1,239	75	252	14	1,715	114	392	23
Wick,	2,146	134	2,678	191	4,527	317	107	6	918	96	...	...	5,440	361	1,269	69	13,031	908	4,054	266
Orkney Isles,	...	...	...	...	2,002	126	...	...	1,135	96	...	...	1,793	137	...	...	4,930	359	...	...
Shetland Isles,	...	...	...	...	2,017	135	140	7	2,691	167	...	...	1,600	115	601	46	6,308	417	741	53
Stornoway,	285	18	332	21	3,740	316	...	...	7,975	736	...	...	3,505	264	146	9	15,505	1,334	478	30
Loch Broom,	...	...	...	...	288	14	...	...	296	16	...	...	...	...	...	...	584	30	...	...
Loch Carron and Skye,	...	...	...	...	537	32	...	...	1,142	96	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,679	128	...	...
Fort-William,	...	...	...	...	581	49	...	...	2,310	107	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,891	156	...	...
Campbeltown,	...	...	...	...	230	14	...	...	520	15	...	...	78	4	...	...	828	33	...	...
Inverary,	...	...	...	...	155	9	...	...	1,670	84	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,825	93	...	...
Rothesay,	...	...	...	...	120	9	...	...	510	38	...	...	...	...	...	...	630	47	...	...
Greenock,	65	5	...	...	630	38	...	...	780	49	...	...	1,113	55	...	...	2,588	147	...	...
Ballantrae,	...	...	...	...	180	16	...	...	50	6	...	...	...	...	...	...	230	22	...	...
Total,	9,271	549	9,187	656	41,210	2,666	637	33	24,857	1,863	...	...	50,624	3,554	19,113	1040	125,962	8,63 2	28,937	1,729

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

No. IV.

FISHERY STATISTICS.—ABSTRACT ACCOUNTS showing the Tonnage of Vessels and Number of Men, the Tonnage of Boats and Number of Fishermen and Boys, and the Number of other Persons employed in the Herring and Cod and Ling Fisheries: SCOTLAND: in the Year ended 31st December 1875.

ABSTRACT.	Tonnage of Vessels and Number of Men.				Tonnage of Boats, and Number of Fishermen and Boys.		Number of other Persons.	Total Tonnage and Persons Employed.			
	British.		Foreign.					British.		Foreign.	
	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Fishermen and Boys.		Tons.	Persons.	Tons.	Persons.
Total of Herring Fishery Account, No. 1, .	2,526¾	414	...	...	...	...	...	2,526¾	414	...	...
Do. of Cod and Ling Fishery Account, No. 1,	6,015	1,453	...	...	...	...	...	6,015	1,453	...	...
Do. of Fishery Statistics Account, No. 2, .	...	...	...	...	105,506	45,082	44,139	105,506	89,221	...	...
Do. of do. No. 3, .	125,962	8,632	28,937	1,729	...	...	...	125,962	8,632	28,937	1,729
Total,	134,503¾	10,499	28,937	1,729	105,506	45,082	44,139	240,009¾	99,720	28,937	1,729

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

Report by the Engineers upon the Harbour Works in progress under the Fishery Board: Scotland: Year 1875.

We beg to report that the only work in progress during the year 1875, has been the removal of the debris from the mouth of Anstruther Harbour; and as operations of this kind are very uncertain and entirely dependent on the weather, the work has not yet been completed.

D. & T. STEVENSON,
Engineers.

Edinburgh, 26*th January* 1876.

HARBOUR ACCOUNTS.

GENERAL ACCOUNT, PIERS OR QUAYS.

An Account of the Sums Received and Paid by the Commissioners of the Fishery Board: Scotland: for Building or Repairing Piers or Quays: under the Act 5th George IV. Cap. 64, in the year ended 31st December 1875.

1875.	*Dr.*				1875.	*Cr.*			
	To Balance at 31st December 1874,	£1,663	7	4	Dec. 31.	By Payments for the Works at Anstruther Union Harbour in year to this date,	£2,461	15	9
Feb. 25.	„ Cash, being proceeds of Sale of an old House at Anstruther, required to be removed for the Works of Anstruther Union Harbour,	11	10	0		„ „ „ Wages to the Inspector of Works,	66	18	8
April 23.	„ Cash, for a Survey of Buckie Harbour by Messrs. Stevenson, the Board's Engineers, and for their Report and Plan for its improvement, paid by the applicants for the Survey,	55	0	0					
June 7.	„ Cash, being Bank Interest upon this Account, for year ended 31st March 1875,	12	18	3					
Aug. 16.	„ Cash, being the Annual Parliamentary Grant for year ending 31st March 1876, applied by the Treasury to bring the Works of Anstruther Union Harbour to completion,	3,000	0	0					
							£2,528	14	5
						„ „ „ Balance,	2,214	1	2
		£4,742	15	7			£4,742	15	7

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

ABSTRACT showing the EXPENDITURE upon the HARBOUR WORKS carrying on by the COMMISSIONERS of the FISHERY BOARD: SCOTLAND: Year ended 31st December 1875.

Dr.

ANSTRUTHER UNION HARBOUR,—COUNTY OF FIFE.

1875.				
	To Balance at 31st December 1874, brought forward from the Abstract of that year,	£1,482	3	6
Feb. 25.	To Cash, being proceeds of Sale of an old House at Anstruther, required to be removed for the Works at Anstruther Union Harbour,	11	10	0
April 23.	„ Cash, for a Survey of Buckie Harbour by Messrs. Stevenson, the Board's Engineers, and for their Report and Plan for its Improvement paid by the Applicants for the Survey,	55	0	0
Aug. 16.	„ Cash, being the Annual Parliamentary Grant for year ending 31st March 1876, applied by the Treasury to bring the Works at Anstruther Union Harbour to completion,	3,000	0	0
		£4,493	13	6

Cr.

ANSTRUTHER UNION HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

1875.				
Dec. 31.	By Payments during the year ended this date, viz.:—			
	For the Works,	£2,461	15	9
	Inspector's Wages,	66	18	8
			£2,528	14	5
	„ Balance carried forward in continuation of the Works,		1,964	19	1
			£4,493	13	6

Fishery Board: Scotland:
Edinburgh, 1st June 1876.

B. F. PRIMROSE, *Secretary.*

REPORT

BY THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE FISHERY BOARD:

SCOTLAND:

OF THEIR PROCEEDINGS

IN THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER 1875,

BEING FISHING 1875.